BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE LANGUAGE AND TEXT OF CODEX NEOFITI 1
IN THE LIGHT OF OTHER PALESTINIAN ARAMAIC SOURCES

by

Julia Adair Foster

(A.B., Duke University, 1958)

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

1969

APPROVED

by

First Reader H. Neil Richardson

Professor of Old Testament

Second Reader James D. Price

Professor of Religion

PLEASE NOTE:

Not original copy. Several pages have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

ABSTRACT

THE LANGUAGE AND TEXT OF CODEX NEOFITI 1
IN THE LIGHT OF OTHER PALESTINIAN ARAMAIC SOURCES
(Order No._____)

Julia Adair Foster, Ph.D.
Boston University Graduate School, 1969

Major Professor: H. Neil Richardson, Professor of Old Testament

The problem of this dissertation is: (a) to evaluate the language of Codex Neofiti 1 in relation to that of other texts of the Palestinian Targum family, other Targums, and other witnesses to Palestinian Aramaic; (b) with the aid of the new evidence provided by Neofiti 1, to re-evaluate the linguistic interrelationships among the various witnesses and the textual relationships of the various Targums, and to make a judgment as to the probable date, location, and manner of origin of each Targum to the Pentateuch.

The method of the dissertation involves a survey of selected language elements from Biblical Aramaic, Qumrân Aramaic, Targums Onkelos and Jonathan, the Cairo Geniza manuscripts, Neofiti 1, the Fragment Targums, Pseudo-Jonathan, the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and Samaritan Aramaic. The basis of selection is the language table found in Gustaf Dalman's Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch.

Although an oral tradition of translation and interpretation of the Scriptures may have existed in the synagogues before the beginning of the Christian era, the language of the Palestinian Targum which is

found in various recensions in the Cairo Geniza manuscripts, the Vatican 440 and Paris 110 (Fragment Targum) groups, and Codex Neofiti 1, cannot be identified with that of this early tradition. Although it may contain expanded or paraphrased passages which are older than the translation in content and language, particularly where poetry is found, its basic translation language is very closely related to that of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim and should not be regarded as earlier than the third century A. D.

Because of certain peculiarities of language which cannot be attributed either to a Hebrew Vorlage or to normal Aramaic usage, the Palestinian Targum should be understood as a translation from a Greek version.

Codex Neofiti 1 has been more heavily revised than any of the members of the Cairo Geniza group. The Cairo Geniza texts themselves, however, show considerable variation between the earliest and latest witnesses. These witnesses do not show a gradual change and mixing of forms, as would be expected if the variations of the later versions came about under the influence of Targum Onkelos, or of scribal familiarity with Eastern forms in general. Rather, a word used consistently in an early version will disappear completely, replaced by another word of identical meaning. The writer is of the opinion that the variations between the earliest texts, manuscripts A and E of the Cairo Geniza, and later versions, can be understood as conscious and deliberate revisions which maintained the language in conformity with a still living and changing Palestinian Aramaic. This conclusion was reached because of the correlation between regular language changes within the

Palestinian Targum tradition and the existence of two or more forms within the language of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, as set forth by Dalman.

Neofiti 1 shows definite signs of the use of other recensions to complete a defective text at the beginning and the end. Short sections from five separate recensions--each identifiable by characteristic orthography, morphology, or vocabulary--can be found in the first four chapters of Genesis, and at least two between Deuteronomy 29:18 and 34:12. Genesis 1 is very nearly identical to the Paris 110 recension, and Deuteronomy 34 to Vatican 440..

As far as language is concerned, Targum Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum must be regarded as independent witnesses to distinct dialects--the first as a second-century A. D. Judean Aramaic translation from Hebrew, the second as a third-century A. D. Galilean Aramaic translation from Greek. Pseudo-Jonathan involves language elements from diverse times and places.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter — Page

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation 1
2. Definitions 3
3. Limitations 22
4. Previous Research in the Field 23
5. The Method of the Dissertation 42

II. RESEARCH IN PALESTINIAN ARAMAIC

1. Introduction 45
2. Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century 46
3. 1930: The Cairo Geniza Fragments 52
4. 1947: The Dead Sea Scrolls 58
5. 1956: Codex Neofiti 1 64
6. Conclusions 64

III. A COMPARISON OF ARAMAIC DIALECTS

1. Introduction 66
2. A Comparison of Dialects 69
   i. Pronouns 69
   ii. Nominal Suffixes 73
   iii. Adverbs 74
   iv. Prepositions 77

Chapter — Page

III. A COMPARISON OF ARAMAIC DIALECTS (Contd.)

v. Conjunctions 78

vi. Interjections 80

vii. Verb Forms (Distinguishing Terminations and Prefixes) 80

viii. Nouns and Verbs (Vocabulary) 81

3. Conclusions 87

i. Origin of the Translation 87

ii. Date 105

iii. Place 110

iv. Summary 111

IV. TEXT RECENSIONS IN CODEX NEOFITI 1

1. Introduction 114

2. The Text Recensions 115

i. Genesis 1-4 115

(1) Genesis 1:1-1:23 117

(2) Genesis 1:24-2:5a 117

(3) Genesis 2:5b-3:4 118

(4) Genesis 3:5-24 120

(5) Genesis 4 121

ii. Deuteronomy 29:18-34:12 122

3. Conclusions 123

Chapter Page

V. TOWARD A CRITICAL TEXT OF THE PALESTINIAN TARGUM

1. Introduction 125

2. The Procedure of Criticism 127

i. Procedure for Deciding Internal Evidence 127

ii. Procedure for Deciding External Evidence 128

iii. Textual Criticism of the Additions 131

iv. Critical Apparatus 131

3. A Specimen Critical Text: Genesis 43 132

VI. CONCLUSIONS 154

BIBLIOGRAPHY 160

VITA 167

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BA	Biblical Aramaic
CG	Cairo Geniza
CPA	Christian Palestinian Aramaic
FT	Fragment Targum
LXX	Septuagint
M	Marginalia
Mh	Marginal hand
Ms, Mss	Manuscript, manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text
Ni	Neofiti 1
O	Onkelos
OJ	Onkelos and Jonathan
P	Paris 110
PJ	Pseudo-Jonathan
PT	Palestinian Targum
PTM	Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim
QA	Qumran Aramaic
SA	Samaritan Aramaic
Th	Text hand
V 440	Vatican 440 text group

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation

The problem of this dissertation is: (a) to evaluate the language of Codex Neofiti 1 in relation to that of other texts of the Palestinian Targum family, other Targums, and other witnesses to Palestinian Aramaic; (b) with the aid of the new evidence provided by Neofiti 1, to re-evaluate the linguistic interrelationships among the various witnesses and the textual relationships of the various Targums, and to make a judgment as to the probable date, location, and manner of origin of each Targum to the Pentateuch.

Before the language of Neofiti 1 can be utilized as a source for Palestinian Aramaic, the relation of its language to that of the other Palestinian Targums must be established. Particularly significant is the relation of Neofiti 1 to the much older witnesses to the Palestinian Targum, the Cairo Geniza manuscripts. The two Fragment Targum families must also be considered. Previous study in this field will be reviewed and further evidence will be presented and evaluated. Particular attention will be given to evidence for the use of more than one recension of the Palestinian Targum in the production of Codex Neofiti 1.

A comparison of early and late manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum, however, can produce only a relative judgment concerning the original date of this text group, since the nature of the Palestinian

Targum is itself in dispute. Disagreement also exists concerning the date and place of origin of Targum Onkelos and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. The newly discovered Neofiti 1 is the only complete Palestinian Targum in existence; it is fortunate that it also contains a marginal critical apparatus which provides what amounts to a second complete, or at least extensive, Palestinian Targum of a variant type. Therefore, if these two texts of Neofiti 1 are judged sufficiently similar to the older manuscripts to serve as representatives of the Palestinian Targum, a completely parallel comparison of language elements in the Palestinian Targum, Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan can be made for the first time.

Such a comparison may suggest possible explanations of the relations among the three Targums. Since the whole question of Targumic origins is subject to widely differing interpretations, however, it is desirable to include in the discussion two further language sources which are more firmly dated and located. The first of these is the Genesis Apocryphon of Qumrân.[1] Entirely aside from any analysis of its language, this text must be dated no later than A. D. 68, the date of the destruction of the Qumrân community.[2] It is perhaps not absolutely necessary, but nevertheless reasonable, to regard its place of origin as the same as the place where it was

---

1. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary, Biblica et Orientalia, N. 18 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966). In addition to publishing the text with commentary, Fitzmyer has provided a grammatical summary: Appendix II, "A Sketch of Qumran Aramaic," pp. 173-220.

2. Ronald de Vaux, L'Archéologie et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte, The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1959 (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 104.

found, the Judean wilderness overlooking the Dead Sea. Such a judgment is supported by its affinity in language with other material from Qumrân and Murabba'ât.[1]

As reasonably well dated witnesses from a later period, the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim may be used. The Palestinian Talmud was essentially complete by A. D. 425;[2] most midrashic material was completed by the middle of the sixth century A. D.[3] Thus these texts are witnesses to the dialect of rabbinic circles in Galilee from the fourth to sixth centuries A. D.

Evidence will also be presented from Biblical Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and Samaritan Aramaic. The first is important as a possible ancestor of later Palestinian language. The latter two are close to the dialect of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim.

2. Definitions

Targum is defined as a Jewish Aramaic translation of the Old Testament. It may include paraphrase instead of direct translation in some cases, particularly where the Hebrew text is either theologically difficult or poetic. Interpretative material additional to the translation may also be included; such material is found occasionally in Onkelos, more frequently in the Palestinian Targums, and most frequently in Pseudo-Jonathan. Most additional material in the Palestinian Targum occurs in solid blocks before or after the

---

1. Infra, p. 20.

2. Hermann L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, Harper Torchbooks (English translation based on 5th German ed.; New York: Harper & Row, 1965; originally published, 1931), p. 65.

3. Ibid., p. 203.

translation; sometimes the translation is divided by the addition. Pseudo-Jonathan presents a more complex arrangement, containing not only long additions paralleling those of the Palestinian Targum but many shorter insertions as well, which have been woven into the translation so that succeeding translation words are separated by the added material. The great majority of verses in all the Targums contain a translation word or phrase corresponding to every word in the Hebrew text. This fact was amply demonstrated by the research method of this dissertation, which involved locating Aramaic equivalents to Hebrew words with the help of a Hebrew concordance. Such a method would be difficult, if not impossible, if PT or PJ contained much totally free paraphrase.

The Samaritan Aramaic translation is also normally called the Samaritan Targum. It is a generally literal translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Since it is not likely to have a direct relationship with the Jewish Targums, it is considered much less fully here.[1] Even if the Samaritan Targum and the Palestinian Targum or Pseudo-Jonathan were found to share a reading stemming from a pre-Masoretic Hebrew text, no identity of language would necessarily accompany such a shared meaning.[2]

Codex Neofiti 1, a complete Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, was discovered and introduced to the scholarly world by Alejandro

---

1. For citations of Samaritan Aramaic, see Chapter III.

2. The writer made a rough collation of the Samaritan Targum with Neofiti 1 for Genesis 31, and found a dissimilarity of vocabulary even more obvious than that between Neofiti and Onkelos.

Diez Macho of the University of Barcelona in 1956.[1] It is a well-preserved and entirely legible vellum manuscript of 450 folios, 446 of which contain the text and colophon. On paleographical grounds it can be identified as an Italian manuscript of the sixteenth century.[2]

---

1. A. Diez Macho, "Una Copia de todo el Targum jerosolymitano en la Vatican," Estudios Biblicos, XVI (1956), 446-47. Roger Le Déaut has pointed out that the manuscript is not, strictly speaking, complete. La Nuit Pascale, Analecta Biblica 22 (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963), p. 38. His statement that Genesis 18:1 is missing is incorrect, and "Exodus 40:11 and 12" should read "12 and 13." The writer has found the following verses partially or wholly missing from the text but supplied in the margin: Genesis 7:3, 29:5, 35:10, 47:11-12, 47:23; Exodus 32:31, 35:15-16, 38:25-26, 40:12-13; Numbers 15:38, 20:18, 21:8-9, 29:27, 30:9, 31:12, 31:37-38; Deuteronomy 2:7, 17:9, 23:12, 27:24, 33:10-11. Missing in whole or in part, without marginal correction, are Genesis 25:25-26, 31:26-27, 35:14, 35:25-26, 36:13-14, 36:21-31, 36:41, 39:13; Exodus 12:14, 12:26, 12:32, 19:23, 21:17, 28:20-21; Leviticus 26:42-44; Numbers 32:11, 32:18; Deuteronomy 14:10. Most of these are errors of homoioteleuton; at Genesis 36:21-31 a whole page must have been skipped. Other smaller omissions in the text occur when the Hebrew verse-openings duplicate a word of the translation and the Aramaic opening words are not given.

2. Shirley Lund, "An Introductory Study of the Codex Neofiti 1 with Special Reference to the Marginal Readings to the Book of Deuteronomy," Thesis presented to the University of St. Andrews in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, August, 1966, p. 4, n. 2. This judgment by Dr. Lund was based specifically on certain characteristics of the cursive marginal notes. The initial announcement by Prof. Diez Macho described the manuscript as fifteenth century. "Una Copia de todo el Targum jerosolymitano," p. 446. Subsequent efforts by Diez Macho ("The Palestinian Targum," Christian News from Israel, XIII (1962), 23) and M. Fitzmaurice Martin ("The Palaeographical Character of Codex Neofiti 1," Textus, Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project, III; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1963, p. 14) to discover a date in the colophon and to relate the manuscript to the work of Aegidius of Viterbo and Elias Levita have led to early sixteenth century dates. For criticism and discussion see Lund, Thesis, pp. 4-12, and G. E. Weil, "Le Codex Neophiti I--à propos de l'article de M. F. Martin," Textus, IV (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1964), pp. 225-29.

The title page shows that the manuscript belonged to a collection housed at the "Collegium Ecclesiasticum Adolescentium Neophytorum." This institute for Jewish converts, founded in 1543 with the name "Hospitale," was reorganized and given the name found on the title page of the manuscript in 1577.[1] The codex was received by Antonio Papulino, lector of the Collegium, in 1602, from Ugo Boncompagni, who had inherited it from the library of Andrea de Monte in 1587.[2]

Three numbering systems are found in the manuscript: Numbering of the quires, usually of ten folios each, on the recto of the first page in each quire; consecutive hand-written numbers on the upper left-hand recto of each folio, inaccurate because page numbers are repeated; and a stamped series of numbers on the lower left-hand recto of each folio, which is accurate and will be followed in references to page numbers in this dissertation. Recto and verso will be indicated by a and b. All the numbering systems begin with the first page of the text.

The text of the manuscript is the work of three scribes, designated as A, B, and C.[3] C is Menahem ben Mordecai, the writer of the colophon. Most pages of the manuscript have extensive marginal and interlinear notations. Frequently the word in the text which corresponds to the beginning of the marginal reading is marked with

---

1. Lund, Thesis, pp. 4, 10.

2. Roger Le Déaut, "A Propos d'une Leçon du Codex Neofiti 1 (Lev. V 21)," Vetus Testamentum, XVII (1967), 362, n. 1; "Jalons pour une histoire d'un manuscrit du Targum palestinien (Neofiti 1)," Biblica, XLVIII (1967), 517ff.

3. Martin, "The Palaeographical Character," p. 15.

a dot. Interlinear readings appear above the words to which they correspond. Ten hands have been identified in the marginal and interlinear material and numbered by order of appearance.[1] Marginal hand 1 is found in correspondence with text hand A and has been identified as belonging to the same scribe. The same is true of marginal hand 10 and text hand C. Marginal hand 9, identified with text hand B, is responsible for only a portion of the annotation of the work of B; Th C/Mh 10 is also found, as well as the seven other marginal hands numbered from 2 to 8. No marginalia are found on folios 75a-80b and 84a-90b.[2]

The text of Neofiti 1 is entirely in square script. The marginal notations are written in square, rabbinic and cursive styles. All the square marginal writing is found in corrections of omissions from the text. Longer omissions, however, are sometimes written in rabbinic or cursive script. The bulk of the marginalia, in cursive script, consist of variant readings to the text. The interlinear notations are in the same script employed for the variant marginalia.[3]

In spite of the multiplicity of hands, the entire work is best understood as a group effort to complete the production of a copy of another fully annotated manuscript. Geoffrey Cowling has pointed out that "on folio 187b . . . the scribe, Menahem ben Mordecai, has picked out his name from the initial letters of consecutive marginal

---

1. Martin, "The Palaeographical Character," pp. 17ff.

2. Lund, Thesis, pp. 13-23.

3. Various terminologies are employed for Hebrew scripts. The writer has followed that used by Dr. Lund, based on Carlo Bernheimer's Paleografia Ebraica (Florence: Olschki, 1924).

notes. . . . He obviously knew, before he had written the first letter, what the three following annotations were. This could not be likely if he was collating the manuscripts himself."[1] The same conclusion is suggested by the placement of marginalia on different lines, or even on different pages (if the line is the first or the last) from the words or phrases to which they correspond. This could easily happen if the scribe were copying the annotations line by line, and the lines of the old and new manuscripts were not in exact agreement. It would not be expected if the scribe were himself collating a variant manuscript against the text.

Shirley Lund found that all marginalia for Deuteronomy 1:1-29:17 could be attributed to two sources.[2] The source which supplies by far the greater proportion of marginalia was identified as a close relative of the Vatican 440 family,[3] and in particular of V and L. The second source which did not seem to represent a continuous text, showed a relation to the tradition of Pseudo-Jonathan but in vocabulary and grammar was closer to Onkelos.[4]

Geoffrey Cowling found that three sources must be postulated to account for the marginalia of Genesis, since three alternate readings

---

1. Geoffrey J. Cowling, "The Palestinian Targum: Textual and Linguistic Investigations in Codex Neofiti I and Allied Manuscripts," Thesis presented to the University of Aberdeen in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, April, 1968, p. 48. Shirley Lund had previously called attention to this acrostic. Thesis, p. 18.

2. The text and marginalia undergo a change after 29:17; see Chapter IV.

3. Infra, p. 14.

4. Lund, Thesis, p. 49.

are found in the margin at Genesis 47:21.[1] The main continuous marginal source in Genesis was discovered to be strikingly similar to Cairo Geniza manuscript E: "In Genesis at least, there is greater agreement between the margin of Neofiti I and Ms. Geniza E, than between either of these and the Vatican 440 text group."[2] (Ms E exists only for Genesis, so no comparison was possible in Dr. Lund's study of Deuteronomy.)

Thus Geoffrey Cowling regards Cairo Geniza manuscript E as the closest relative to the principal marginalia of Neofiti 1; he describes Cairo Geniza Ms F and the Vatican 440 text group as secondary witnesses to the same text type.[3] The writer's own observations confirm this judgment. Cowling also includes in the broader family of "Manuscript E and its allies" CG Mss A and (probably) B, and "much of Paris 110."[4] Cairo Geniza manuscript A shows no striking correlation with the Neofiti margin.[5] Manuscript B is extant only parallel to a section of Neofiti which is probably of a different text type from the main body of the manuscript;[6] here also no striking correlation with the marginalia can be found, but it is not certain that the marginalia are continuous with those following, because of the change of text. Paris 110 is described by Cowling as a "mixed text, containing some readings in close agreement with Ms. E, others apparently

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 49.
2. Ibid., p. 216.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. This has been noted by Cowling. Ibid., p. 245.
6. See Chapter IV.

agreeing with the Neofiti I group."[1] In Deuteronomy, P "proved not to be significant,"[2] in comparison with the V 440 group, as a witness agreeing with the marginal variants. In Genesis, on the other hand, P seems more nearly equal to V as a witness agreeing with Mi M. The writer made a collation of significant (more than orthographic) variants from parallel verses of P and V against CG Ms E, which resembles Mi M very closely. Out of a total of 132 variants, 93 were found in V and 78 in P; 39 were common to V and P. One long expanded verse, Genesis 38:25, showed a very definite close resemblance between E and P against V. When the variants of this verse were left out of account, remaining variants totalled 59 for V and 62 for P, of which 30 were in common. The large number of divergent variants suggests that the V 440 manuscripts and P have developed independently from a text type similar to that of E; that is, P is not simply a more mixed and revised version of V 440, but has a different history. At least for Genesis, then, P may agree with Mi M in a significant number of instances where V 440 disagrees. A more detailed comparison of the marginalia themselves with these Mss will be necessary to prove or disprove this hypothesis.

Geoffrey Cowling, in agreement with Shirley Lund, has found readings with a vocabulary resembling that of Onkelos in the secondary and tertiary marginalia to Neofiti: "In Genesis 44:18, the one complete variant in the margin agrees almost precisely (even to the

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 216.

2. Lund, Thesis, p. 29, n. 1.

non-Galilaean morphology) with the Tosephta Onkelos (as in the Biblia Hebraica Ixar 1490)."[1]

Concerning the principal marginalia of the E type, Cowling concludes that "we may also deduce from the consistency of the marginal variants throughout the Pentateuch, that a manuscript similar to E was extant for all the books and was used throughout."[2] It would be difficult to prove that such a manuscript was complete, since expected marginal variants sometimes do not appear. However, they do appear sufficiently regularly that one must envision an extensive source. The discussion of marginal language in this dissertation will be limited to that of this extensive primary set of marginalia, referred to as Mi M.

The text of Neofiti 1 has been identified by Geoffrey Cowling with that underlying quotations found in the Sefer-he-ʿAruk of Nathan ben Jehiel.[3] These quotations agree even more specifically with the interlinear variants in Neofiti. This interlinear text "appears on the whole to be a worse text" than the basic text of Mi: "The distinction between ’ and ה, which the Geniza fragments show to be earlier than the eighth century, is lost. The orthography is more conformed to that of Onkelos."[4] Since ʿAruk is dated about 1100, the text of Neofiti must be antedated sufficiently to allow time for such a revision to be made.[5] Cowling also finds evidence of the use of a

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 233.
2. Ibid., p. 218.
3. Ibid., p. 233.
4. Ibid., p. 236.
5. Ibid.

second manuscript almost identical to Ni in the interlinear notations.[1]

A microfilm of Codex Neofiti 1 from the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and a copy reproduced from that microfilm have been used for this dissertation.

The Cairo Geniza Manuscripts, fragmentary texts of the Palestinian Targum, are extremely valuable for the study of this Targum because they date from a time when it was still in active use. These Targum texts were found, together with a great many other documents in Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, and Greek, in the walled-up Geniza or storeroom of the Synagogue of Old Cairo. The existence of this store of manuscripts was rediscovered in the last century, and from 1864 onward various collections from the Geniza found their way into museums in Europe and the United States. The most noteworthy collection was made in 1896 by Solomon Schechter for the University Library in Cambridge.[2] In 1930 Paul Kahle brought together for publication out of the various collections Palestinian Targum fragments from seven manuscripts.[3] Kahle has dated these manuscripts, on paleographical grounds, from the seventh century A. D. (Ms A) through the tenth or eleventh centuries A. D. (Mss F and G). Ms E, which shares many distinctively Palestinian orthographic traits

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 236.

2. Paul Kahle, The Cairo Geniza (2nd ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959), pp. 3-13.

3. Paul Kahle, Masoreten des Westens, II (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1930).

with Ms A,[1] is dated to the second half of the eighth century A. D., while B, C, and D all seem to belong to the second half of the ninth century A. D.[2] All the manuscripts except F and G, which give selected readings, seem to be portions of complete texts of the Palestinian Targum; from this fact Kahle concludes that:

> Es ergibt sich also, dass noch in der Zeit von 700-900 in Palästina vollständige Handschriften mit dem alten palästinischen Pentateuchtargum geschrieben worden sind, und die prachtvolle Ausstattung zumal der Handschriften B, C und D beweist, dass dieses Targum damals noch in hohem Ansehen gestanden haben muss.[3]

E. Y. Kutscher, who differs from Kahle considerably in his view of the history of Aramaic dialects,[4] nevertheless concurs in a high valuation of these texts as basic to the study of the language of the Palestinian Targum.[5]

---

1. These traits, the most prominent of which is the regular use of he rather than aleph as a final vowel letter in all cases, including the determinative ending, are characteristic of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim and the Palestinian Targum. Gustaf Dalman, Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch (2nd ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960; photographic reproduction; first published 1905), pp. 24, 70. The same orthography with he is characteristic of Samaritan Aramaic as well (Prof. James D. Purvis, private communication). As far as the Jewish Aramaic dialects are concerned, some scholars would maintain that these traits are distinctively Galilean, i.e., characteristic of the period of the Galilean Talmudic schools, at least in their fullest development (see Chapter II). However, since both Talmud and Targum are called "Palestinian," this terminology will be followed here.

2. Kahle, Masoreten des Westens, II, 2*-3*.

3. Ibid., p. 3*.

4. See Chapter II.

5. E. Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study," Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV (1958), 3.

For this dissertation, the following Cairo Geniza texts were consulted: Mss A-F published by Kahle;[1] additional sections of Ms E, published by A. Diez Macho;[2] a manuscript distinct from A-G published by W. Baars.[3] An additional section of CG Ms B, Genesis 2:17-3:6 (E. N. Adler 2107 fl.), was not available to the writer but was included in the concordance described below.

A "Cairo Geniza Concordance," giving a complete listing of all forms found in CG Mss A through F, was made available to the writer by Geoffrey Cowling.[4] This concordance has been an invaluable aid to the writer's understanding of the language of the Cairo Geniza material.

The Vatican 440 text group is one of two text groups often classified together as the "Fragment Targums." Cowling's terminology, "Vatican 440 text group" and "Paris 110 text group," will be followed in this dissertation.[5] The name, "Fragment Targums," is somewhat

---

1. Kahle, Masoreten des Westens, II, 1-62. CG Ms G was excluded from consideration because of its free poetic form, quite distinct from that of Mss A-F, and its lack of distinctively Palestinian language. Also excluded was another CG Ms which seems to fall into the same category as Ms G: Y. Komloš, "Nosah ha-Targum ʿal qᵉriʾat Yam-Suf," Sinai, XXII (1959), 223-28.

2. "Nuevos Fragmentos del Targum Palestinense," Sefarad, XV (1955), 31-39.

3. "A Targum on Exod. XV, 7-21 from the Cairo Geniza, Vetus Testamentum, XI (1961), 340-42. The Baars Ms appears to be a relatively late text resembling the text of Neofiti 1, which can be used to restore its numerous lacunae. No estimate of the date of the Ms was included in the article.

4. This as yet unpublished concordance was presented with Dr. Cowling's 1968 Ph.D. thesis, University of Aberdeen.

5. Cowling, Thesis, p. 50.

misleading since it suggests that the texts in question are physically incomplete or damaged. This is not the case; rather, these Targums give selections, ranging from single words to long expansions, of readings from the Palestinian Targum.

The distinction between the Paris 110 group and the Vatican 440 group has long been recognized,[1] but has too frequently been ignored, and is re-emphasized by Malcolm Doubles.[2] The manuscripts of the Vatican 440 group preserve very nearly identical selections (except that the Leipzig manuscript is less complete); the Paris 110 selection is different although it overlaps at many points.

The Vatican 440 group includes five manuscripts and one printed edition, as follows:

Vatican 440 is a beautiful and perfectly preserved manuscript which has been dated to the thirteenth century A. D.[3] The "Targum Yerushalmi" selections are found at the end of a two-volume work containing the Torah with Targum Onkelos and the five Megilloth. Malcolm Doubles considers this manuscript the most valuable member of the group because of its superior preservation of Palestinian forms.[4]

---

1. It was clearly stated in the editio princeps of Paris 110: Moses Ginsburger, ed., Das Fragmententhargum (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1899), p. xii.

2. Malcolm C. Doubles, "Toward the Publication of the Extant Texts of the Palestinian Targum(s)," Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965), 17-18.

3. Cowling, Thesis, p. 52.

4. Malcolm C. Doubles, "Indications of Antiquity in the Orthography and Morphology of the Fragment Targum," in In Memoriam Paul Kahle, ed. by Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 79-89.

Leipzig 1 strongly resembles Vatican 440 in its readings but is far less complete. Exodus and Leviticus are completely missing. The text is written in the margin of a manuscript of Targum Onkelos, which is in poor condition in some sections, particularly at the beginning of Genesis.[1]

The Bomberg text is that first printed in the Biblia Rabbinica of 1517-18,[2] and repeated in each new edition of the Rabbinic Bible up to the present.

Nuremburg Solger 2,2° closely resembles Bomberg, and another manuscript, Sassoon 264, is identical to the Bomberg text, apart from mistakes and pointing. If the identification of the Yemenite Sassoon manuscript as seventeenth century is correct, it could not be the manuscript from which the Bomberg text was produced; it could be understood either as a copy of that manuscript or even as a copy of the printed text. Ms Or 10,794, fol. 8 of the British Museum is a one-page fragment.[3]

The source used in this dissertation for the Vatican 440 group is the edition prepared by Malcolm Doubles.[4] This edition is greatly superior to Ginsburger's work (which gave, in addition to the complete Paris text, variants of Vatican 440, Leipzig 1 and Nuremburg Solger

---

1. Ginsburger, Das Fragmententhargum, pp. ix-x.

2. Felix Pratensis, ed., Biblia Rabbinica, 1st ed. (Venice: Bomberg, 1517-18).

3. Cowling, Thesis, p. 50.

4. Malcolm C. Doubles, "The Fragment Targum: A Critical Re-examination of the Editio Princeps, Das Fragmententhargum by Moses Ginsburger, in the Light of Recent Discoveries," Thesis presented to the University of St. Andrews in application for the degree of Ph.D., June, 1962, pp. 1-122.

2,2° to Bomberg) in completeness, accuracy and convenience. Vatican 440 is reproduced and variants from the Bomberg, Nuremburg, and Leipzig texts are included in a critical apparatus. Readings of Paris 110, Neofiti 1, Onkelos, and Pseudo-Jonathan which agree with any of these variants are also cited. Another valuable and helpful feature from this thesis is Appendix A, "Verses Found in PVENL," a complete listing for Paris 110 as well as the Vatican 440 group.

The four texts used in Doubles' edition will be cited in this dissertation as VENL, in that order.[1] The group as a whole will be referred to as the Vatican 440 group, or simply V 440.

The Paris 110 text group includes Codex Paris 110, the fragments Strasbourg Ms n. 4017 and E. N. Adler 656, and the additions to Codex Paris 75 (a manuscript of Onkelos) at Genesis 38:25-26 and 44:18.[2]

The Paris 110 manuscript preserves a considerable amount of material not found in the other Palestinian Targums, including lengthy poems. The writer has made a collation of verses present in P, but not in the Vatican 440 group, against the Neofiti text and margin. Fully half of the verses contained material markedly different from both Neofiti sources. Where V 440 and P both exist there is usually a similarity to one another and to the E-Ni M text type; P, however, is much more likely to vary from E-Ni M by agreement with Onkelos.

---

1. L, which is close to V, is cited last because it is so often missing altogether. In any case where there might be confusion between B (Bomberg) of the Vatican 440 group and Ms B of the Cairo Geniza, the names will be written out.

2. Cowling, Thesis, pp. 52-53.

Paris 110 is the only extensive source for translation language within this group. The Ginsburger edition of 1899 has been used.[1] Paris 110 is designated by P, and, when cited together with the Vatican 440 group or any members of it, has been placed first: PVBNL.

Targum Onkelos was the official Targum of the Babylonian branch of Judaism by the fifth century A. D.,[2] and eventually displaced the Palestinian Targum in Palestine as well.[3] Although, as a standardized text, it does not display the variety of readings found in the various Palestinian Targum manuscripts, there are many small variants from one version to another. The edition of Onkelos edited by Alexander Sperber has been used in this dissertation.[4] This edition is based upon Ms Or. 2363 of the British Museum and is printed with the Babylonian vocalization of this old manuscript.[5] An apparatus provides variant readings from other manuscripts and old printed editions.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is known from two sixteenth-century sources: the printed edition which appeared in the Rabbinic Bible published by Asher Forins in Venice in 1591,[6] and which, like the

---

1. Ginsburger, Das Fragmententhargum, pp. 3-62.

2. Harry Meyer Orlinsky and John Frederick Stenning, "Targum," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965, XXI, 811.

3. According to Paul Kahle, this did not occur before 1000 A. D. The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., p. 195.

4. Alexander Sperber, ed., The Bible in Aramaic, Volume I: The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959).

5. Ibid., p. v.

6. Doubles, Thesis, p. 1*.

Bomberg text, has been reprinted in subsequent Rabbinic Bibles; and one manuscript, London Manuscript British Museum add. 27031.[1] Ginsburger's edition, which is the source for Pseudo-Jonathan for this dissertation, takes what he considers the preferable readings from the two sources, with appropriate notes for the variant readings. The text is nearly complete, lacking only occasional verses.

Pseudo-Jonathan gained its name through being mistakenly labeled as the work of Jonathan ben Uzziel, the writer to whom the Targum to the Prophets is ascribed. This error probably arose from a misunderstanding of an abbreviation for "Targum Yerushalmi." During the last century the designation of "Targum Yerushalmi I" was often applied to Pseudo-Jonathan; the Fragment Targums (the Vatican 440 and Paris 110 groups) were designated as "Yerushalmi II," and the Tosefta passages found in versions of Onkelos as "Yerushalmi III."[2]

Since the discovery of the Geniza fragments it has been generally recognized that Pseudo-Jonathan has distinctive characteristics setting it apart from the "Palestinian Targum" in its various versions in the Cairo Geniza manuscripts and the Vatican 440 and Paris 110 groups. Thus the announcement of Neofiti 1 as the first complete "Palestinian Targum" identified it as a member of this latter group, contrasted to Pseudo-Jonathan which, although complete and in some respects "Palestinian," appears to have had a different history. This distinction has been followed in this dissertation; thus the term "Palestinian Targum" or PT does not include PJ.

---

1. Moses Ginsburger, ed., Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Usiël zum Pentateuch) (Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903), title page.
2. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., pp. 27-29.

The Genesis Apocryphon is an imaginative and much expanded version of material from the book of Genesis. Although it follows the order of the Biblical narrative, it cannot really be classified as either Targum or Midrash, but is closer to the kind of "historical novel" exemplified by "intertestamental literary compositions such as Enoch, Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, etc."[1] The language of this work has been analyzed by Joseph A. Fitzmyer in an appendix to his publication of the text and commentary.[2] The writer has examined a considerable number of other texts from Qumrân and Murabba'ât[3] and concluded that this grammar does serve as a fair representative of "Qumrân Aramaic," i.e., Aramaic of a period not later than A. D. 68. The manuscripts from Wadi Murabba'ât, Wadi Seiyal and Wadi Habra, which can be dated from A. D. 70-135,[4] include a great many contracts, which tend to be conservative in language. The only texts encountered by the writer which show some language characteristics markedly different from those of the Genesis Apocryphon and closer to those of the Targums are the Aramaic letters of Bar Kochba.[5] These will be discussed in Section 4 of this chapter and in Chapter II. Also of interest are two fragmentary Targum texts found at Qumrân. The Targum of Job has been published in part.

---

1. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, p. 9.
2. Supra, p. 2.
3. For a comprehensive bibliography of published Dead Sea texts, see Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, pp. 17-18, 24.
4. Ibid., p. 25.
5. Y. Yadin, "Expedition D," Israel Exploration Journal, XI (1961), 36-52.

Its translation language is very close to the Biblical Aramaic of the Book of Daniel.[1] The very small fragments of the Targum of Leviticus have not been published but the translation is said to be literal.[2] These texts also will be discussed further in Chapter II.

The grammars of Gustaf Dalman and Joseph A. Fitzmyer already noted are the authorities for, respectively, the languages of the Targums and Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, and the language of the Genesis Apocryphon.[3]

---

1. A. S. van der Woude, "Das Hiobtargum aus Qumran Höhle XI," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, IX , Congress Volume, Bonn, 1962 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), pp. 322-31.

2. Biblia Polyglotta Matritensa. Series IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. L. 5: Deuteronomium, caput 1. Editio critica curante A. Diez Macho (Madrid, 1965), p. 3.

3. The following were also constantly consulted:

   Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, eds., Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. 3rd ed. Vol. I. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

   _____, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. 2nd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

   _____, Supplementum ad Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

   Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. 2 vols. New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1950. First published 1903.

   Solomon Mandelkern, ed., Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. 6th ed. revised. Tel-Aviv: Schocken Publishing House Ltd., 1964.

   Emil Brederek, Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos. Gressen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1906.

   Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927.

3. Limitations

This dissertation is concerned specifically with the language of Codex Neofiti 1 and related texts. Attention has been given to general patterns of language usage, not to individual unusual readings.

Although some comment has been made on paraphrastic and expanded material, the chief focus of attention is upon the translation language.

Since the chief method of research employed was the tracing of Hebrew-Aramaic correspondences with a concordance, much more attention has been given to readily isolated unitary forms than to more complex linguistic phenomena such as syntax. A number of basic language elements such as verb endings, pronominal suffixes, and infinitive forms have been analyzed by taking samplings of common words, however.

The discussion in general has not dealt with variations of pointing but has been limited to the consonantal forms.

The linguistic survey included both the text of Neofiti 1 and its primary set of marginal variants, but not, in general, the additional secondary and tertiary variants in the margins or the interlinear variations. Nevertheless such a survey did include the greater part of the translation variation, since most of the secondary and tertiary marginalia are expanded passages, while the interlinear variants are generally very minor.

4. Previous Research in the Field

In 1949, while studying manuscripts of Targum Onkelos at the Vatican, Professor Alejandro Diez Macho of Barcelona discovered a manuscript whose inner title page read "Targum Humash Yerushalmi," in contradiction to the designation of "Targum Onkelos" on the cover. Since his interest at that time was in early manuscripts of Onkelos, he assumed that this medieval manuscript was a copy of Pseudo-Jonathan, and did not investigate the matter further. In 1956, however, he obtained a copy of the manuscript and, upon comparing it with the Cairo Geniza texts published by Paul Kahle and himself, discovered that this was indeed a complete copy of the Palestinian Targum. This important discovery was announced in 1956 in his article, "Una Copia de todo el Targum jerosolymitano en la Vatican."[1]

A more complete announcement by Prof. Diez Macho followed, entitled "Una Copia Completa del Targum Palestinense al Pentateuco en la Biblioteca Vaticana."[2] Further announcements followed during 1957: "The Complete Palestinian Targum: a new and important discovery of the Spanish Aramaic scholars";[3] Father Boccaccio, S. J. (Biblical Pontifical Institute of Rome), "Integer Textus Targum

---

1. Supra, p. 5. It is understandable that Prof. Diez Macho should stress the completeness of this manuscript in comparison with previous sources for the Palestinian Targum. It is somewhat more difficult to understand why, after six years of work on the publication of the manuscript, he still states that "there was no verse which was not either literally translated or paraphrased in the Palestinian Aramaic." "The Palestinian Targum," Christian News from Israel, XIII (1962), 20.

2. Sefarad, XVII (1957), 119-21.

3. Arbor, XXXVI (1957), 516-18; Punta Europa, No. 14 (1957), 116-17.

Hierosolymitana primum inventus in codice Vaticano";[1] Matthew Black, "The Recovery of the Language of Jesus,"[2] and a more extensive treatment, "Die Erforschung der Muttersprache Jesu."[3]

In their 1957 articles, Prof. Diez Macho and Principal Black both strongly emphasized the importance of the manuscript for the recovery of the Aramaic spoken during the lifetime of Jesus. In this view they followed Paul Kahle's evaluation of the language of the Palestinian Targum.[4] Diez Macho summarized this view:

> The intrinsic importance of it derives from its being a very old translation from the whole Pentateuch into the Palestinian Aramaic, done by Jews from Palestine, not in literal translation form, like the Onqelos Targum, but very often paraphrased, which implies a very old exegesis of the sacred text.[5]

Two assumptions are made in asserting that Codex Neofiti 1 represents "the language of Jesus": first, that the Palestinian Targum, for which we have no manuscripts older than the seventh century, is essentially the same in language as a Targum in use in Palestine in the first century A. D., or even earlier; second, that the sixteenth-century Codex Neofiti 1 can be used as a source for this early language on a more or less equal footing with the much earlier Cairo Geniza texts. Much of the discussion which has followed has involved the first, more basic premise as much as or more than the precise status of Codex Neofiti 1 itself.

---

1. Biblica, XXXVIII (1957), 237-39.
2. New Testament Studies, III (1957), 305-13.
3. Theologische Literatuszeitung, IX (1957), 654-68.
4. See Chapter II.
5. Diez Macho, "The Palestinian Targum," p. 25.

In 1957 Paul Kahle examined photographs of Neofiti 1 and wrote Diez Macho that "there is not the slightest doubt that we have here the Palestinian Targum."[1] In the summer of the same year Alejandro Diez Macho presented the manuscript at the Second World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem.[2]

In 1958 Prof. Kahle wrote an article in which he re-stated his view concerning the antiquity and linguistic value of the Palestinian Targum,[3] and made reference to the newly discovered Codex Neofiti 1: "Das Palästinische Pentateuchtargum wird sprachlich und sachlich von grösster Bedeutung sein, nun da wir es vollständig in Händen haben."[4] He also criticized E. Y. Kutscher for referring to the language of the Palestinian Talmud, Midrashim, and the Palestinian Targum as "Galilean Aramaic,"[5] since, in Kahle's view, this was the spoken language of all the people of Palestine, and for neglecting to use this language as a criterion for the dating of the Genesis Apocryphon, emphasizing, however, that a full evaluation could not be made until

---

1. Diez Macho, "The Palestinian Targum," p. 22.

2. Ibid.

3. Paul Kahle, "Das palästinische Pentateuchtargum und das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramäisch," Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIX (1958), 100-116.

4. Ibid., p. 111.

5. The reference was to Kutscher's 1958 article, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study," Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Scripta Hierosolymitana, Vol. IV (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1957), pp. 1-35.

new editions and critical works had appeared for the Aramaic texts involved.[1]

E. Y. Kutscher's indignant reply to Kahle's criticism appeared two years later.[2] Kutscher insisted that, in dating a language, one must work from materials having an established date. Thus, his emphasis had been on inscriptions and other materials whose date and place of origin were certain. He questioned the validity of employing the language of the Palestinian Talmud (third-fifth centuries A. D.) for the dating of a text necessarily no later than the first century A. D. on purely external grounds. The same argument would apply a fortiori to the Cairo Geniza Targums (and Neofiti 1, an even later manuscript):

> Wir wären Prof. Kahle zu grossen Dank verpflichtet, wenn er uns zeigen könnte, wie man mit Hilfe dieser Texte, aus dem 7.-9. Jh., unsern Text ins 1 (!) Jh. datieren kann.[3]

Kutscher concluded that Kahle had no evidence for assuming the language of Palestine had not altered during a period of 500-700 years, even if there were evidence for the antiquity of the ideas found in the Targum: "Was Kahle . . . bezüglich des Inhalts behauptet, ist für die Sprache dieses Targum demnach vollkommen belanglos."[4]

---

1. The article appeared, almost unchanged, as Chapter III of the second edition of The Cairo Geniza, pp. 191-208, which appeared the next year. One very noteworthy change was made, however. In the article Kahle described the Genesis Apocryphon as "zwar in aramäischer Sprache, in der dem Volke der Bibeltext verdolmetscht wurde" (p. 106). In The Cairo Geniza he described it as a text "written in literary Aramaic" (p. 200). This latter judgment is the correct one in terms of Kahle's own view.

2. E. Y. Kutscher, "Das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramäisch," Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LI (1960), 46-54.

3. Ibid., p. 48.

4. Ibid., p. 54.

In the same issue a brief reply from Kahle appeared, stressing that new publications and language studies were being made by his students and the students of his students, and expressing the hope that with this additional study the issue would be clarified.[1]

In 1958 Geza Vermes utilized Codex Neofiti 1 as a source for the study of the ancient Jewish exegesis of Exodus 4:24-26.[2] He found the reading of Neofiti close to that of the Fragment Targum (no Cairo Geniza text is available for this passage), confirming the status of the manuscript as a Palestinian Targum. Targum Onkelos, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, and the Septuagint, as well as the Palestinian Targum witnesses, were all found to "follow the same interpretative tradition which . . . is of Palestinian origin."[3] A few years later Vermes published a book of studies of Jewish tradition which incorporated a revised version of the above article as well as a number of other articles utilizing Neofiti 1 as a source for the Palestinian Targum.[4] Neofiti 1 seldom differs importantly from the other witnesses to the Palestinian Targum in meaning, though variations in wording are found; Pseudo-Jonathan, on the other hand, was frequently found to contain a divergent or supplementary interpretation. The main concern of this series of studies is the meaning of the Targumic material, not its language. Apparently Vermes

---

1. Paul Kahle, "Das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramäisch: Erwiderung," Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LI (1960), 55.

2. Geza Vermes, "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis: New Light from Ancient Sources," New Testament Studies, IV (1958), 308-19.

3. Ibid., p. 311.

4. Geza Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies, Studia Post Biblica, IV (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961).

accepted Kahle's judgment on the language of the Targums: "From the study of these new texts [the Cairo Geniza fragments], especially of their language, he concluded that the Palestinian Targum corresponds to a stratum of targumic tradition older than the official Targum Onkelos."[1] In one study he has found Neofiti 1 to contain a mixed or conflated interpretation, combining elements from the Fragment Targum and the Targumic Tosefta: "This example indicates that Neofiti cannot be considered as a pure version of Targum Yerushalmi."[2]

At the Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament at Oxford in 1959, Prof. Diez Macho presented a paper giving the first extensive evaluation of Neofiti 1.[3] After a presentation of evidence for the pre-Mishnaic dating of the Palestinian Targum, Diez Macho discussed geographic names in Neofiti 1 which, according to Professor Albright, pointed to the second century A. D. as the date of "the last recension of N."[4] As his primary evidence for the early dating of the basic text of this manuscript, he gave a long list of forms which, he claimed, showed a Hebrew Vorlage different from that of the Masoretic text. His conclusion was that "the PT, even if it in its present recension, preserved in the Ms Neofiti 1, seems to belong to the first or second

---

1. Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, p. 4.

2. Ibid., p. 20.

3. Alejandro Diez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: its Antiquity and Relationship with the other Targums," Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, VII, Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), pp. 222-45.

4. Ibid., p. 229.

century A. D., is on the whole a prechristian version."[1] He did point out, however, that the text of Neofiti seemed to be somewhat more under the influence of Onkelos than the readings of the margins, which "preserve apparently a purer Palestinian Aramaic."[2]

In 1962 a detailed criticism of Diez Macho's text-critical arguments for a pre-Masoretic date for the Palestinian Targum came from P. Wernberg-Møller.[3] After calling for publication of a thorough study of the entire text of Neofiti 1, he made a detailed re-examination of each of Diez Macho's variant readings. His conclusion was that

> the text of Neofiti 1, where it differs from MT, is either (a) dependent on a variant reading found in one or several of the ancient versions and/or in some medieval Hebrew manuscripts, or (b) loosely paraphrasing or (c) corrupt . . . . The text-critical material presented by Macho is incapable of proving a pre-Massoretic, pre-Christian date of the Palestinian Targum.[4]

Neofiti 1 was utilized by P. Grelot in 1959 for his study of the Cain and Abel tradition in the Targums.[5] Grelot emphasizes the antiquity of the traditions found in the Palestinian Targum but cautions against too high a date for the language in which these traditions were fixed: "Sa fixation par écrit pourrait . . . être placée à l'époque des Amoraïm, ou même des Tannaïm."[6] He believes

---

1. Diez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," p. 236.
2. Ibid., p. 238.
3. P. Wernberg-Møller, "An Inquiry into the Validity of the text-critical argument for an early dating of the recently discovered Palestinian Targum," Vetus Testamentum, XII (1962), 312-30.
4. Ibid., pp. 316, 330.
5. P. Grelot, "Les Targums du Pentateuque: Etude comparative d'apres Genese, IV, 3-16," Semitica, IX (1959), 59-88.
6. Ibid., p. 86.

that the Palestinian Targum was a written source for Targum Onkelos, which he therefore dates quite late (7th-8th centuries A. D.). Vocabulary differences between the two Targums are attributed to deliberate archaizing on the part of the writer of Onkelos. Pseudo-Jonathan must be later yet as it is dependent on Onkelos, a version of the Palestinian Targum (close to that of Neofiti 1), and the Midrashim. The Cairo Geniza texts are considered the best representatives of the original "Palestinian Targum," with Neofiti and the Fragment Targum representing divergent further developments into two forms of the "Jerusalem Targum." Targum Onkelos is tentatively considered to be based upon the Fragment Targum type.[1]

Another study of the same passage was made by Geza Vermes in 1963.[2] He found a considerable number of cases where Neofiti 1 agreed with Onkelos or Pseudo-Jonathan against other Palestinian Targum witnesses. Although these cases could be due to medieval contamination, such an explanation would not suffice to explain the relation of Pseudo-Jonathan to Onkelos, the principal subject of the language analysis made in this article. Vermes, disagreeing with Grelot, argued that Pseudo-Jonathan could be the source of Onkelos, or both could stem from a common source.[3]

---

1. Grelot, "Les Targums du Pentateuque," p. 85. Grelot is very careful to stress the tentative nature of this hypothesis, based upon a single passage. Such care is justified, since a more extensive survey would reveal that the relation of Neofiti readings to those of Pseudo-Jonathan is not constant.

2. Geza Vermes, "The Targumic Versions of Genesis IV 3-16," The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society, Vol. III, 1961-62 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), 81-114.

3. Ibid., p. 98. For further discussion see Chapter III.

J. T. Milik, in a 1961 article, has connected a reading found in Neofiti 1 with a place name found on a Byzantine processional cross. He considers Diez Macho's date for Neofiti too high.[1]

In 1963 Prof. Diez Macho reviewed recent studies in Palestinian Aramaic and discussed the language of Codex Neofiti 1 further, in relation to the dialect of the Aramaic letters of Bar Kochba written shortly before A. D. 135.[2] Such personal letters are to be valued highly as evidence for the spoken language of the writer. Perhaps the most prominent characteristic of the language of the letters is their regular use of yath, not only in pronominal forms but before names as well. This precise usage is found elsewhere only in the Targums, and is equally characteristic of Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum. Several other characteristics, including the frequent use of final he for the definite article and of ה׳ instead of ה, link this dialect with that of PT. On the other hand, there are also forms characteristic of Onkelos, most notably אנחנה. Diez Macho regards these letters as particularly good evidence for a relation between the Palestinian Targum and the spoken language of Palestine (including not only Galilee, but Judea, where the letters were found).[3] The article closes with the statement that a critical text of Neofiti 1 is in preparation, together with a lexicon and

---

1. J. T. Milik, "'Saint-Thomas de Phordêsa' et Gen.14,17," Biblica, XLII (1961), 77-84.

2. A. Diez Macho, "La lengua hablada por Jesucristo," Oriens Antiquus, II (1963), 95-132.

3. Ibid., p. 113. E. Y. Kutscher, however, emphasizes their relation to Onkelos: "Leshonan shel ha-iggarot ha-ibriyyot wa-aramiyyot shel Bar Kosebah u-bene doro," Leshonenu, XXV (1961), 117-33.

grammar of Palestinian Aramaic: "Realizado todo este trabajo podremos decir que conocemos el arameo hablado por Jesucristo."[1]

In 1963 Roger Le Déaut's study, La Nuit Pascale, was published.[2] This commentary on the Targum of Exodus 12:42 and related traditions makes use of Neofiti 1 as well as all the other Targums and reviews research in the Targumic field. Le Déaut notes that Neofiti has left certain verses untranslated, in the same fashion as Onkelos and in accordance with Mishnaic rules; from this he concludes that Neofiti has come under the influence of Onkelos.[3] In general, however, he accepts the view of the language of the Palestinian Targum (and of Neofiti in particular) put forward by Diez Macho.

In 1965 a sample chapter of the Biblia Polyglotta Matritensa appeared.[4] In the preface Prof. Diez Macho explained that the "editio princeps" of Neofiti 1 was complete, but that the editors of the Madrid series had decided other PT material should be included in the edition. This meant that final publication would be further delayed, particularly since new editions were to be made from the manuscripts of Paris 110 and Pseudo-Jonathan, to correct the errors of the unsatisfactory editions by Ginsburger. Since the texts of the Palestinian Targum show so much variety, it was decided to print each witness separately. Again, a grammatical work was promised as an appendix to the five-volume Polyglot series.[5]

---

1. Diez Macho, "La Lengua hablada por Jesucristo," p. 120.
2. Supra, p. 5, n. 1.
3. Le Déaut, La Nuit Pascale, p. 38.
4. Supra, p. 21, n. 2.
5. Biblia Polyglotta Matritensa, specimen, pp. 2-3.

This specimen volume was reviewed by W. Baars, who expressed the hope that the full text of the "eagerly awaited edition of the now famous copy of the Palestinian Targum on the Pentateuch" would soon appear. He criticized the decision to print the texts separately as showing "the bankruptcy of textual criticism," and pointed out that the Leipzig, Sassoon and Moscow ("reported to exist") manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum had not been included.[1] In conclusion he said:

> Without endorsing the highly speculative opinions of Prof. Diez Macho about the origin, antiquity or importance (especially his linguistic arguments are not likely to carry conviction) of the text he brought to the front, one hopes to see the completion of the project here initiated in a not too distant future.[2]

Martin McNamara, in The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch,[3] makes a detailed analysis of various points of contact of the Palestinian Targum with the New Testament. Here, as in Le Déaut's work, the emphasis is not on language in general but on particular readings. McNamara points out that Neofiti follows major points of halakah and therefore in its present recension is from Talmudic or later times. He also notes that Neofiti uses uniform words or phrases to render particular words or phrases of the Masoretic text through.[4] The opening section of McNamara's book contains an excellent summary of Targumic studies.[5]

---

1. W. Baars, review in Vetus Testamentum, XVII (1967), 127-28.
2. Ibid., p. 128.
3. Analecta Biblica 27 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).
4. Ibid., pp. 62-63.
5. Also published as "Targumic Studies," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVIII (1966), 1-19.

In a recent article,[1] E. Y. Kutscher has described Neofiti 1 as possessing a better text than that of the Bomberg printed edition. He warns, however, that it should not be overrated, as a comparison with the Cairo Geniza manuscripts shows that it cannot be regarded as "undoctored."[2]

A number of dissertations have appeared involving Codex Neofiti 1. Four in particular have been made available to the writer and have been extremely useful for this dissertation.

Three of these were written under the supervision of Principal Matthew Black of St. Andrews, Scotland. The work of Malcolm Doubles, which has already been mentioned,[3] provides a full discussion of language variations within the Vatican 440 group, as well as the extremely valuable textual material already described. In the dissertation and in an article derived from it, Doubles emphasizes the variant recensions of the Palestinian Targum and the varying influence of Onkelos on each:

> Since it is generally admitted that the Palestinian Targum never had a fixed text, to present it now in a single text with a single critical apparatus would be to manufacture a targum which in reality has only a very short history.[4]

Concerning Neofiti 1, he states that it "often reflects a source formerly found only in P, which since the time of Ginsburger has been

---

1. E. Y. Kutscher, "Mittelhebräisch und Jüdisch-Aramäisch im Neuen Köhler-Baumgartner," Hebräische Wortforschung, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, XVI (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), pp. 158-75.

2. Ibid., p. 174.

3. Supra, p. 16, n. 4.

4. Doubles, "Toward the Publication," p. 26.

recognised as the latest of the Fragment Targum materials," and also often reveals the influence of Onkelos.[1]

Gerard J. Kuiper has made a detailed re-examination of the relation of Pseudo-Jonathan to Onkelos and to all the witnesses to the Palestinian Targum.[2] After an introductory study of the various views regarding the nature of Pseudo-Jonathan, he analyzes selected passages from the Targums, choosing those for which many versions are extant. He finds that PJ shares the Palestinian vocabulary in many instances both in the translation and in the expanded material; that, even when it differs from PT witnesses it may nevertheless preserve a reading of a Palestinian type; and that all the Targums agree with Onkelos on occasion, independently.

His conclusion is that Pseudo-Jonathan is a Palestinian Targum, one of a number of traditions preserved from an early time. He takes this characteristic of free and variant translation as the original one, and sees Onkelos as a later, much edited version, which has taken elements from the various Palestinian versions.

Since there has been general agreement that PJ and PT are related in the expanded sections, Kuiper's conclusions concerning the translation of PJ are of particular interest: "Of the verses proper

---

1. Doubles, "Toward the Publication," p. 26.

2. Gerard Johannes Kuiper, "The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and Its Relationship to Targum Onkelos," Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, 1962. This thesis is to be published as a book by Brill in the near future. Another article by Kuiper on a related subject is "A Study of the Relationship between A Genesis Apocryphon and the Pentateuchal Targumim in Genesis 14:1-12," in In Memoriam Paul Kahle, ed. by Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1968), pp. 149-61.

in PJ we can confidently say that generally they read with Par, Bom, CG, and N, and stand in a tradition other than O."[1]

In 1966 Shirley Lund completed "An Introductory Study of the Codex Neofiti 1 with Special Reference to the Marginal Readings to the Book of Deuteronomy."[2] Her findings regarding the marginalia of Deuteronomy have already been summarized. The discussion of typical words and phrases in the marginalia and of their relationship to the language of the Vatican 440 group was particularly helpful as background for this dissertation.[3]

References to the three theses described above, as well as a description of the discovery of Codex Neofiti 1 and some of the ensuing discussion, can be found in Chapter III of the new edition of Matthew Black's An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts.[4]

---

1. Kuiper, Thesis, p. 384. This conclusion seems to be valid for the passages examined. However, both Cowling and the writer have come to a different conclusion with the use of a different sampling method (see Cowling, Thesis, pp. 250-62; Chapter III of this dissertation). The selection of passages made by Kuiper was governed by the presence of Paris 110. It is a reasonable assumption that the verses preserved by Paris 110 and by the Vatican 440 group represent a selection of Targum Yerushalmi material which was considered particularly valuable and interesting. If PJ did not have a complete PT at his disposal, he would have been most likely to have a similar collection of interesting Yerushalmi material.

2. Supra, p. 5, n. 2. Chapter III has appeared as "The Sources of the Variant Readings to Deuteronomy 1:1 to 29:17 of Codex Neofiti 1," in In Memoriam Paul Kahle, pp. 167-73.

3. Lund, Thesis, pp. 26-32.

4. 3rd ed.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967. Also see his "Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus," in In Memoriam Paul Kahle, pp. 17-28.

The doctoral thesis of Geoffrey J. Cowling, which has already been extensively quoted,[1] is the first systematic treatment of the language of the Palestinian Targum as a whole, and the single most valuable piece of work for the purposes of the writer of this dissertation. For this reason his views are presented here rather fully. Following is the Summary statement of this thesis:

> This investigation had two main aims: a) to determine the nature of the original text of the Palestinian targum and its probable date of composition; b) to elucidate the present textual situation, the relationship of the extant manuscripts and their relative value.
>
> Very little evidence supports the widely-accepted pre-Christian date of composition. Oral Aramaic translations are first spoken of in the late second century A. D. There is no evidence for the existence of the Palestinian targum—or any standard translation other than the Greek—before the late third century at the earliest.
>
> The original text did not contain many (if any) of the interpolated commentaries and stories found in the late manuscripts. The language is "translation Aramaic" but is basically that of fourth to sixth century Galilee, although some features (particularly orthography) resemble those in earlier works. Some features of the syntax are explicable only if we assume that the translation was made not from the Hebrew but from a Greek version.
>
> The best text is to be found in Manuscripts A and E of the Cairo Geniza: the distinctive readings of this latter text are also to be found--amongst others--in the margin of Neofiti I. The later manuscripts B and F of the Cairo Geniza, Vatican 440 and Leipzig I witness to the same text, but show influence from the Targum Onkelos and have much more added material. Manuscript C is a less reliable member of the same group. Manuscript D and Neofiti I have suffered (probably independently) considerable revision which has removed much of the original features; and have acquired much additional matter.
>
> The text of Neofiti I is substantially the one quoted by R. Nathan (c. 1100 A. D.). The margin of Neofiti I may have two alternatives to words in the translation and up to three alternate versions of the interpolated material. One

---

1. Supra, p. 8, n. 1. A summary of this thesis appeared as "New Light on the New Testament? The Significance of the Palestinian Targum," The Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin, University of Aberdeen, Spring, 1968.

> set of these variants shows frequent agreement with Pseudo-Jonathan and the Talmudic literature.[1]

Beyond describing Neofiti 1 as one of the more revised texts of the Palestinian Targum, Cowling states specifically that Ni shows revision beyond that found in any of the CG texts (including D):

> In comparison with the Geniza fragments, Neofiti I has suffered a great deal more from the influence of the Hebrew text. The almost complete alteration of ממרה דיי to יי is one example; the almost complete alteration of דאית to די is another. Many Greek words have been eliminated, in favor of native Aramaic words (e. g. קרבן for דורון) or Hebrew borrowings (כפלא for דיפלה). In many cases we must see a direct influence of Onkelos--something which we cannot be certain of in the Geniza fragments.[2]

Because of this process of revision, as well as the large amount of interpolated material, he prefers a date for Ni somewhere between A. D. 800 and 1000.[3]

The basis of Cowling's "Grammar of the Palestinian Targum" is the Cairo Geniza material.[4] He emphasizes the importance of sets of words which translate one Hebrew word differentially--i.e., according to context. An example is the distinction made between ידע --to know intellectually--and נכר--to recognize personally. This distinction is characteristic of PT but not of O. Five Hebrew words of this type have been checked exhaustively for translation equivalents in available PT witnesses, PJ and O.[5]

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, Summary (no page number).
2. Ibid., p. 238.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., pp. 97-98, 119-83.
5. Ibid., p. 112. An identical method underlies the data summarized in Chapter III of the present dissertation.

This study of differential distribution provides Cowling with one of his grounds for the conclusion that Pseudo-Jonathan is not a Palestinian Targum. PJ consistently uses several very common words from PT;[1] he also uses a considerable number of rare and obscure Palestinian words.[2] A large number of language elements in PJ in the intermediate range between the obvious and the rare, and "those features which are brought out by the analysis of the distribution of synonyms, are identical with Onkelos."[3] Cowling concludes that

> the data . . . reinforces the conclusion first enunciated by G. Dalman that the author of Pseudo-Jonathan had a complete text of Onkelos before him, but not a complete Palestinian tradition. The data suggests that the author used a midrashic book (or, probably, several) from which he took whatever suited him, and wove it into his text.[4]

Finally, Cowling has made the entirely new suggestion that the Palestinian Targum is a translation from a Greek version--probably that of Theodotion. This judgment is based on certain peculiarities of language found only in the Palestinian Targum and texts already known to be translations from Greek:

> If the divergences [from a form paralleling the Hebrew] were regular, but represented normal Aramaic idiom, the conclusion could be drawn that the translation was a free rendering of the Hebrew. If the divergences are regular and represent distortions of the Aramaic idiom, then it may justly be suspected that the translation was not made from the Hebrew. This is confirmed if those divergences can be paralleled in the Christian Palestinian lectionary, which is a translation of the Greek.[5]

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 90.
2. Ibid., p. 256.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 257.
5. Ibid., p. 186.

Geoffrey Cowling finds the following features which are best explained by a Greek original:

> (i) The complete absence of the pronominal object affixed to the verb . . . . There seems no other explanation of this feature of the Palestinian targum, but that it was translated from a Greek version, a version which followed the Hebrew as nearly as possible—but which could not follow the Hebrew in this feature which was absolutely foreign to the nature of the language.
>
> (ii) The use of the Relative: The Palestinian reading avoids a participle after a relative, and uses the imperfect for past continuous. Neither of these are typical of Aramaic.

Before a preposition דהוה is used for past, דאית for present. In earlier and Galilean (PTM) Aramaic דאית is used only with ל for possession; occasionally with ב.

> This use of אית as a copula can only be paralleled in Syriac where there is 'imitation of the Greek use of words, Greek idiom and Greek construction, penetrating into the most delicate tissues of the language.' There is no evidence of this in fourth century Galilean Aramaic. Hence this--which can only be due to Greek influence--must come by translation of a Greek original.

(iii) Agreements with Greek versions have been found at Genesis 4:8, Numbers 28:9, Deuteronomy 30:11, 12.[1]

(iv) Use of Greek words--especially those which seem not to have been "Aramaized" sufficiently to take a pronominal suffix:

דורון דידיה (Gen. 4:4, 5, 32:22)

פלטין דידיה (Gen. 43:16, 44:1).

(v) Equivalence of Hebrew and Aramaic words: Cases where an Aramaic word exists entirely equivalent to the Hebrew word, but a different Aramaic word is used in translation.

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, pp. 79, 80, 192. Further examples discovered by the writer are given infra, p. 98.

(vi) אוף and לחוד :

> The Palestinian targum translates all the particles--אף, גם, רק, אך --by the one word לחוד . . . . It would be surprising if any translator able to translate at all would confuse אף : also with רק : only . . . . This is no evidence for a Greek version, but it does argue against the use of the Hebrew.[1]

Two types of evidence are included in the above listing: usages that do not seem to be normal Aramaic, and readings agreeing with the Greek versions against the Masoretic text. These two phenomena can each be explained in more than one way: the first, as simply evidence of the influence of Greek on the translator's style; the second, as evidence for a pre-Masoretic date for the Palestinian Targum, or, alternatively, for the survival of alternate forms of the Hebrew text after A. D. 90. There is only one explanation, however, that serves equally well for <u>both</u> types of evidence: that of an underlying Greek version. Cowling's hypothesis, therefore, has been accepted.

Roger Le Déaut has recently published a study comparing Cairo Geniza manuscript F with the Neofiti 1 text and margin.[2] He has discovered that the margin is closely related to the Cairo Geniza version and therefore considers it of great value. He describes the text of Ni as a reworked, and perhaps poorly transmitted, version, showing a relationship to P. In spite of its revised character it is much more homogeneous than Pseudo-Jonathan, whose vocabulary and readings are an amalgam of the Palestinian Targum and Onkelos.[3]

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, pp. 186-202.

2. R. Le Déaut, "Lévitique XXII 26-XXIII 44 dans le Targum Palestinien: De l'importance des gloses du <u>codex Neofiti 1</u>," <u>Vetus Testamentum</u>, XVIII (1968), 458-71.

3. <u>Ibid</u>., p. 470.

Le Déaut's study was made without any acquaintance with the work of Cowling or the writer; for Dr. Lund's work he had only a reference in the third edition of Dr. Black's An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. (He confirms the observation of Lund that Ni M is related to the Vatican 440 group.) His substantial agreement with the conclusions presented here and by Cowling, then, constitutes an independent corroboration of these findings.

5. The Method of the Dissertation

The method of this dissertation was to survey certain key forms and vocabulary items from the following sources: Biblical Aramaic; Qumrân Aramaic; Targums Onkelos and Jonathan; the Cairo Geniza texts; Codex Neofiti 1; the Fragment Targums; Targum Pseudo-Jonathan; the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim; Christian Palestinian Aramaic; and Samaritan Aramaic. The table compiled by Gustaf Dalman in his Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch served as a source and point of departure for this survey.[1] This table presents typical and regular variations between the language of Onkelos and Jonathan ("Targumisch") on the one hand and that of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim ("Galiläisch") on the other. Dalman also cites Biblical Aramaic forms in correlation with the first list and the usage of Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Samaritan Aramaic, and the "Jerusalem Targum" in connection with the second. For all of these except the Jewish Targumic sources, Dalman has been taken as authority. Since the category of "Jerusalem Targum" included both the Fragment Targums and Pseudo-Jonathan, this evidence was disregarded and an entirely

---

1. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., pp. 44-51.

new survey of the language of the Targums was undertaken. It was first determined which Hebrew word or words corresponded to the Aramaic form employed by Targum Onkelos. A survey was then made, with the aid of a Hebrew concordance, of corresponding Aramaic forms for all the Targumic sources. For Qumrân Aramaic, the source was the text and grammar of the Genesis Apocryphon in The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I by Joseph A. Fitzmyer.

This survey method proved to be an exceptionally suitable approach for the organization of language data simultaneously on several levels. In addition to the ten groupings of language sources described above, further distinctions were included, where appropriate, between the various individual manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza and Fragment Targum groups and between the text and margin of Codex Neofiti 1. All of this material is presented and analyzed in Chapter III of the dissertation.

This survey also revealed definite evidence of the existence of parts of more than one recension of the Palestinian Targum within Codex Neofiti 1. There was evidence of the use of variant manuscripts to complete the beginning (Genesis 1-4) and end (Deuteronomy 29:18ff) of the text. A separate section, Chapter IV, was devoted to the description of these different recensions within the manuscript.

The writer has selected for presentation in Chapters III and IV material not presented previously by Cowling or other writers. For example: Dr. Cowling has provided with the thesis a complete concordance of the Cairo Geniza fragments, and has included a grammatical summary based upon the language of these texts, and specifically upon the language of the texts he considers the best witnesses to PT,

Cairo Geniza manuscripts A and E. He has then commented on the linguistic and textual relationships of the remaining witnesses to the Palestinian Targum to these good versions (primarily to manuscript E), and has commented further on the language of Targums Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan. A very limited amount of specific evidence for these conclusions has been included. The present dissertation provides a large number of specific examples corroborating the more general judgments presented by Cowling. The intent of the writer has been to make the findings and contributions of this dissertation complementary to the research of Cowling.

Chapter II of the dissertation is a survey of research in Palestinian Aramaic from the early nineteenth century to the present. Chapters III and IV have been described above. Chapter V presents tentative guidelines for establishing the original text of the Palestinian Targum, based upon the conclusions of Chapter III, and includes a specimen critical text of the Palestinian Targum of Genesis 43. Chapter VI presents the writer's conclusions.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH IN PALESTINIAN ARAMAIC

1. Introduction

References to Aramaic dialects are found in rabbinic writings and in the New Testament,[1] and we possess a variety of materials on the language of the Targums, Talmuds, and Midrashim, dating from the year A. D. 1100 onward.[2] It was not until the nineteenth century, however, that systematic efforts began to make a separate study of Palestinian Aramaic. Since the locations and dates of the Talmuds and Midrashim were reasonably certain, most of the controversy centered around the language of the Targums. It was apparent that the language of Targums Onkelos and Jonathan differed strongly from that of the Babylonian Talmud, and in many ways resembled Biblical Aramaic, while the language of Pseudo-Jonathan and of the Fragment Targums was closer to that of the Palestinian Talmud, but nevertheless showed certain contacts with that of Onkelos. The proper interpretation of these facts, however--and of various kinds of external evidence--was, and is, open to dispute.

The early period, described by McNamara as the "Golden Age of Jewish Studies,"[3] was one of intensive work in a wide variety of fields related to Jewish life and thought. Specific attention was focused

---

1. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., pp. 4-6.

2. For a survey of this material see McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum, pp. 7-14.

3. Ibid., p. 15.

on the Targums and their language because of the possibility of gaining insight into the life and language of pre-Talmudic Judaism, or--from a Christian viewpoint--into the life and language of the time when Jesus lived. In this century, several new discoveries have added to our store of material for the study of Palestinian Aramaic: First the Cairo Geniza material, then the Dead Sea manuscripts, and most recently Codex Neofiti 1. Each of these has produced new studies; the following discussion therefore can be conveniently divided into periods following each discovery.

2. Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century

In 1832 Leopold Zunz published the first edition of Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden.[1] He maintained that there must have been written Aramaic translations in the time of the Hasmonaeans, in the language of the people, and dated Onkelos to the time of Philo. He considered Targum Jonathan to the Prophets somewhat different in dialect from Onkelos and subsequent to it; both, however, were prior to passages in Talmud and Midrash depending upon them. He regarded Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragment Targum as different recensions of the same work, and described their language as a Palestinian dialect with a mixture of Hebrew, similar to the Jerusalem Talmud, the Midrashim, and the Targums to the Writings. Although he believed that free or expanded translation was the older usage, he

---

1. Berlin: A. Asher, 1832. 2nd ed., Frankfurt on Main: J. Kaufmann, 1892.

2. "Fragment Targum" referred to the printed text of Bomberg. Paris 110 and the variants to Bomberg of V, N, and L were published for the first time by Ginsburger in 1899.

dated the Palestinian Targum--which used these older free Targums--to the second half of the seventh century A. D., on the basis of a number of late readings.[1]

Z. Frankel, however, concluded from his study of the Targums in relation to the Greek texts that targumic activity had existed already in the early Hellenistic age and that an early date for the Palestinian Targum must therefore be assumed.[2]

In 1857 Abraham Geiger published his Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von den innern Entwicklung des Judenthums.[3] In agreement with Frankel, he regarded the Palestinian Targum as the earlier one, which never had a full recension or a fixed text; the text was fixed and edited first in Babylonia in the form of Targum Onkelos. The Palestinian Targum was, therefore, to be valued for its presentation of older traditions.

Theodor Nöldeke agreed with Geiger in seeing the Palestinian Targums as sources for a tradition older than that of Onkelos, although much later traditions were found in them as well.[4]

Hermann Seligsohn, on the other hand, believed that Onkelos was the earliest Targum; that the Fragment Targum had never existed in a full recension but had been composed as a series of glosses to

---

1. Zunz, Die Gottesdientliche Vorträge, 1st ed., pp. 61-83.

2. Z. Frankel, Vorstudien zur Septuaginta (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841), pp. 185-91; Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik (Pentateuchus) (Leipzig: Barth, 1851.

3. Breslau: Verlag von Julius Hainauer, 1857.

4. Theodor Nöldeke, Die alttestamentliche Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt von Theodor Nöldeke (Leipzig: Quandt & Händel, 1868).

Onkelos; and that the still later Pseudo-Jonathan had completed the work, creating a new Targum, but one dependent on and later than Onkelos.[1]

In 1862 an English translation of Targums Onkelos, "Jonathan ben Uzziel" (Pseudo-Jonathan), and the Jerusalem Targum (Bomberg) was made by J. W. Etheridge.[2] The translation was specifically intended to be an aid in working with the Targums in the original Aramaic, and with this end in view was rendered in an extremely literal, word-for-word style.

A work dealing more specifically with linguistic problems was that of S. D. Luzzatto, Elementi grammaticale del Caldeo Biblico e del Dialetto Talmudico Babilonese.[3] Luzzatto distinguished four dialects in addition to Biblical Aramaic and the language of the Babylonian Talmud: (1) Onkelos and Jonathan, which he believed to represent a literary dialect in use in Babylon, while the Babylonian Talmud was written in the common language of the Babylonian Jews; (2) Pseudo-Jonathan, the literary language of Palestine; (3) the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, the common dialect of the Jews of Palestine; (4) the Targums of the Writings.

W. Bacher agreed with Frankel, Nöldeke and Geiger that the Palestinian Targum, in its oldest form, was earlier than Onkelos. He dated the Fragment Targum to the Babylonian period, regarding it

---

1. Hermann Seligsohn, De Duabus Hierosolymitana Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus (Breslau: Typis Sulzbach, 1858).

2. J. W. Etheridge, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1968; first published 1862).

3. Padua: A. Bianchi, 1865.

as a set of glosses to Onkelos, and Pseudo-Jonathan to Islamic times. In his article for the Jewish Encyclopedia he stressed that O, FT and PJ had a common origin in an older Palestinian Targum.[1]

None of the works described above provided a systematic treatment of Palestinian Aramaic. A work of the type suggested by Luzzatto was never written. Instead, Gustaf Dalman's Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch gave an inclusive treatment of all dialects which could be regarded as Palestinian.[2] In the first edition of 1894 he gave much attention to the language of the Palestinian Targums (including Pseudo-Jonathan), believing they might include sections from an early period. However, he discarded this possibility in Die Worte Jesu,[3] and in the second edition of his Grammatik, where he regarded Onkelos and Jonathan as the best witnesses for an early Judean dialect, in spite of their "literary" character. He took the Aramaic portions of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim as examples of Galilean Aramaic of a somewhat later period, while the language of the Palestinian Targums was described as "mixed" and not earlier than the fifth century A. D., because of the presence of Babylonian Aramaic words and signs of dependence upon Onkelos.[4]

---

1. W. Bacher, "Targum," Jewish Encyclopedia, 1906, XII, 57-63.

2. Supra, p. 13, n. 1.

3. Gustaf Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, mit Berucksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäische Sprache, erörtert (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898; 2nd ed., Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930; English translation, The Words of Jesus, Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1902).

4. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., pp. 6-51.

Dalman evidently saw no reason to attempt to distinguish between the languages of Targums "Jeruschalmi I" (PJ), "Jeruschalmi II" (FT), and "Jeruschalmi III" (Tosefta to Onkelos). Since PJ was by far his most extensive source, his judgment of PT as a source of "mixed" language is heavily influenced by PJ.[1]

Dalman's work, which has been reprinted recently, remains the only comprehensive grammar available for these dialects. The summary tables of "Targumic" and "Galilean" differences in vocabulary and form, at the beginning and end of the book, provide a helpful orientation to the main distinctions between the dialects of Onkelos-Jonathan and of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim.[2] These tables, again, do not specify which "Jerusalem Targum" provided the data. It is fortunate that all citations in the main body of the book do specify "JI," "JII," or JIII." Since we now have, in the Cairo Geniza texts and Neofiti 1, a great deal more of the "Jerusalem Targum," the book is badly out of date.

Dalman's view of the Palestinian Targum as late and "mixed" was also that of Jacob Bassfreund, who followed Dr. Zunz in most respects.[3] He found this Targum to be dependent on the Talmud and the younger Midrashim, and dated it in its basic form to the second half of the seventh century A. D. Both the Fragment Targum and Pseudo-Jonathan were described as later versions of the one original

---

1. In Chapter III a re-study of some of his evidence will be made.
2. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., pp. 44-51, 395-411.
3. Jacob Bassfreund, Das Fragmenten-Targum zum Pentateuch (Breslau: S. Schottlaender, 1896).

Palestinian Targum. Since time had to be allowed for the development of divergent recensions, these recensions could be dated at the earliest from the eighth century A. D.[1]

Moses Ginsburger also saw the influence of Onkelos in Pseudo-Jonathan and the Fragment Targums. His edition of Pseudo-Jonathan included an apparatus giving the relationships of the additional material in PJ to Talmudic and Midrashic sources and to O.[2]

In 1924 a smaller grammar, based upon that of Dalman, was published by William B. Stevenson.[3] His inclusion of Old Testament Aramaic paradigms is helpful for comparative purposes. A recent second edition of this work includes an Appendix on the Numerals by J. A. Emerton.[4] Emerton remarks that Dalman's views, accepted by Stevenson, have been outdated by Paul Kahle's work on the Palestinian Targum: "If, therefore, Stevenson were preparing this Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic today, it is likely that he would make a different selection of dialects."[5]

The history of the editions of Stevenson's grammar is illustrative of the history of Palestinian Aramaic studies in general. In 1924 the view of Dalman was dominant. Since 1930, however, a quite different view, identified with the name of Paul Kahle, has been in ascendancy.

---

1. Bassfreund, Das Fragmenten-Targum, p. 98.
2. Ginsburger, Pseudo-Jonathan, pp. xiv ff.
3. William B. Stevenson, Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic (Oxford: At the University Press, 1924).
4. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1962.
5. Emerton, Appendix in Stevenson, Grammar, 2nd ed., p. 98.

3. 1930: The Cairo Geniza Fragments

In 1930 Paul Kahle published, in Masoreten des Westens, II,[1] a number of fragmentary manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza containing portions of the Palestinian Targum. These manuscripts, unlike the Fragment Targums, gave a complete verse-by-verse rendering of portions of the Pentateuch. Some gave the full Hebrew verse alternately with the Aramaic; in others, only the first few words of the Hebrew stood before each Aramaic verse. These manuscripts thus were evidence for widespread use of a complete Palestinian Pentateuch Targum. The earliest of the manuscripts was dated to the seventh century A. D., the beginning of the eighth at the latest. A theory such as Bassfreund's that the Palestinian Targum first came into existence in the seventh century thus became untenable, since time had to be allowed for the dissemination of the Targum from Palestine to Egypt. The presence of multiple recensions of the Targum, moreover, suggested that it was held in high esteem and was in regular use in the West long after Targum Onkelos had become established in the East.

The language of the Cairo Geniza manuscripts, furthermore, did not show the relationship to the language of Onkelos found in Pseudo-Jonathan, but resembled closely the dialects of the Palestinian Talmud, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and Samaritan. Thus there was no barrier to dating this Targum to a period contemporary with, or earlier than, the Palestinian Talmud. Kahle took this language relationship as a sign that the Palestinian Targum had been the

---

1. Supra, p. 12, n. 3.

original Targum of Palestine, written, like the Palestinian Talmud, in the language of the people. He described the language of Targum Onkelos as an artificial, literary one, pointing out that Dalman had also regarded it as literary, a scholarly production. Pseudo-Jonathan was seen as a combination of Onkelos and the older Palestinian Targum.

Prof. Kahle emphasized the importance, for the recovery of the Palestinian spoken language, of the pointing found in these texts, particularly Ms A which had Palestinian vocalization.[1]

In 1941, Kahle gave the Schweich Lectures on the Cairo Geniza materials.[2] He further emphasized the Babylonian provenance of Targum Onkelos and the artificial nature of its language.[3] He maintained, in addition, that the text (and language) of the Palestinian Targum could be dated, not merely to a period contemporary with the Palestinian Talmud, but to pre-Christian times. This conclusion was based on a passage from Pseudo-Jonathan (Deut. 32:11) which seemed to refer to John Hyrcanus in a manner not possible after the time of his government (135-105 B. C.), and upon the non-Mishnaic interpretation

---

1. Kahle, Masoreten des Westens, II, 1*-13*.

2. The lectures were published as The Cairo Geniza (1st ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1947).

3. Kahle was an expert in the field of vocalization and had made a careful study of the Babylonian punctuation of the Mss of Onkelos found in the Cairo Geniza, as well as the Palestinian and early Tiberian pointing of the Palestinian Targums of the Geniza. The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., p. 191. His conclusions regarding the Babylonian (and literary) nature of the pointing of Onkelos have never been challenged. The origin of the consonantal text of Onkelos cannot be placed in Babylonia with the same degree of certainty, however.

of Exodus 22:4, 5 found in CG Ms A and (in a reference in the second edition) in Codex Neofiti 1.[1] Upon the basis of these two passages and the generally popular, Midrashic character of the translation and its lack of a fixed text, Kahle based his conclusion that "in the Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch we have in the main material coming from pre-Christian times . . . . And we possess this material in a language of which we can say that it is very similar to that spoken by the earliest Christians."[2]

This conclusion, as we have seen, has been followed by Kahle's students, most notably Matthew Black and Alejandro Diez Macho. A somewhat different approach was taken by Renée Bloch.[3] She understood the Palestinian Targum as essentially a midrashic work--a forerunner of the more developed Midrashim, and a better source for the religious content of Judaism than the more official, halakic pronouncements more characteristic of the Talmud. In her first article, she described Pseudo-Jonathan as the basic Palestinian Targum, and the Fragment Targum as a second recension, thus disagreeing with Kahle on this point.[4] However, in a later article, after a thorough study

---

1. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., pp. 200-208. Evidence from Pseudo-Jonathan is considered relevant, since it is regarded as preserving some traditions belonging to the ancient Palestinian Targum not encountered elsewhere. The Exodus passage is discussed in detail by Georg Schelbert, "Exodus xxii 4 im Palästinischen Targum," Vetus Testamentum, VIII (1958), 253-63.

2. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., p. 208.

3. Renée Bloch, "Note Methodologique pour l'Étude de la Littérature Rabbinique," Recherches de Science Religieuse, XLIII (1955), 194-227.

4. Ibid., p. 211.

of Genesis 38:1-30, she concluded that PJ was more developed, edited, and influenced by O.[1] This linguistic influence did not, however, destroy its value as a source of ancient Palestinian traditions.[2]

Vermes, Le Déaut, Grelot, and McNamara, in the works mentioned in Chapter I, all share the high valuation of the Palestinian Targum made by Kahle and Bloch. Vermes and McNamara in particular share Renée Bloch's high estimate of Pseudo-Jonathan as a source of early traditions.[3]

The scholars mentioned above, and a considerable number of others, have taken as proved Kahle's contention concerning the antiquity of the language of the Palestinian Targum. Unfortunately, little was accomplished until very recently in the actual study of the language of this Targum. A proposed grammar based upon the Cairo Geniza fragments, to be published by Paul Kahle and William B. Stevenson,[4] was never completed. In the years following the publication of the fragments, Prof. A. J. Wensinck of Leiden made a study of the language of the Palestinian Targum and of the closely related Aramaic of the Palestinian Talmud, with the aim of producing a lexicon and grammar which, unlike that of Dalman, would be based entirely upon Palestinian material using "the language spoken in

---

1. Renée Bloch, "Note sur l'utilisation des fragments de la Geniza du Caire pour l'étude du Targum Palestinien," Revue des Études Juives, XIV (1955), 5-35. A note accompanying this article announced her untimely accidental death in July, 1955.

2. Ibid., pp. 30-31.

3. Supra, p. 5, n. 1; p. 27, ns. 2, 4; p. 29, n. 5; p. 30, n. 2; p. 33, n. 3.

4. Kahle, Masoreten des Westens, II, p. 11*, n. 3.

Palestine at the time of the beginning of Christianity there."[1] This material was left incomplete at Wensinck's death in 1939; it was later utilized by Kahle, who copied all the slips Wensinck had made for a Palestinian Aramaic Dictionary into a bound volume. This Dictionary was then made available to Matthew Black, J. Bowman, and T. Jansma, but the work was never completed or published.[2] More recently, Prof. Kahle had provided Renée Bloch with the manuscript material at his disposal; she intended to publish a critical edition of the Palestinian Targum.[3] Shortly after her death, Codex Neofiti 1 was discovered. Since that time, the focus of attention has been upon the production of a grammar of Palestinian Aramaic utilizing the new manuscript. Such a work is planned by Prof. Diez Macho's pupils.[4]

In 1939 a grammar of a more limited scope than that of Dalman appeared. Hugo Odeberg published the Aramaic sections of Bereshit Rabba, the oldest expositional Midrash, together with a grammatical summary.[5] A new grammar of the same Midrash, based on the Ms Vat. Ebr. 30, which preserves a purer Aramaic than the edition used by Odeberg, is now in preparation.[6] E. Y. Kutscher has published a series of studies of the language of this manuscript in the Hebrew

---

1. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., p. 203.
2. Ibid., p. 204.
3. Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, p. 9, n. 3.
4. Supra, p. 32, n. 1.
5. Hugo Odeberg, The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba, With Grammar of Galilean Aramaic (2 vols.; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1939).
6. McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum, p. 31.

journal Tarbiz.[1] Another important work of 1939 was that of Franz Rosenthal, Die Aramaistische Forschung,[2] which summarized all phases of Aramaic research through 1937. Rosenthal accepted Kahle's valuation of the language of the Palestinian Targum, but believed that the language of Onkelos--the consonantal forms, not the pointing--could have been used in Palestine as well as in Babylonia as a special scholarly dialect, and as such could have an early origin, demonstrated by its closeness to Biblical Aramaic.[3]

Except for the incomplete work of Wensinck, there seems to have been no systematic effort to analyze the language of the Palestinian Targum as found in the Cairo Geniza texts. Neither was any systematic comparative work done with the Cairo Geniza texts and the later texts of the Fragment Targums and Pseudo-Jonathan. The relationship of CG Ms E to the Vatican 440 group was first mentioned by Renée Bloch in 1955,[4] and this relationship was fully explored only with the efforts of Lund and Cowling to identify the marginalia of Neofiti 1.

In the meantime, a completely new body of Aramaic material became available when the Dead Sea Scrolls came to light, and a new approach was made to the whole question of Palestinian Aramaic.

---

1. E. Y. Kutscher, "Studies in Galilean Aramaic," Tarbiz, XXI-XXIII (1949-1952), offprint, pp. 1-58 (in Hebrew).

2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. Photomechanical reproduction; first published 1939.

3. Rosenthal, Die Aramaistische Forschung, pp. 130-31.

4. Bloch, "Note sue l'utilisation des fragments," p. 24.

4. 1947: The Dead Sea Scrolls

Since 1947, a considerable number of Aramaic documents from Qumrân, Murabba'ât, and other locations in the area East and Southeast of Bethlehem have been published. These manuscripts can be dated, on external grounds and on the basis of paleographical studies, between the second century B. C. and the first part of the second century A. D. Linguistically, they show varying degrees of development from Imperial Aramaic, with which they show strong affinities. For this reason they have all been classed by the Kahle school as "literary" products.[1]

Paul Kahle classed Biblical Aramaic and the Aramaic of Targum Onkelos together as "the same literary language . . . . from the language of texts composed in literary Aramaic we cannot recognize when and where they were written. We can only pick up hints from certain characteristics deriving from the copyists of the texts due to the language spoken by them."[2] A quite different view has been developed by E. Y. Kutscher. He sees the period between the composition of the Book of Daniel and the appearance of the Talmudic dialects as a time of linguistic transition when Imperial Aramaic gradually became broken down into separate dialects. During the earlier stages of this development, Eastern and Western dialects were not yet clearly distinguished. Nabatean and Palmyrene inscriptions, dated from the first century B. C. through the third century A. D., are not in Syriac but in a language closer to Imperial Aramaic--and

---

1. With the exception of the Bar Kochba letters, supra, p. 31.
2. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., p. 193.

to the Aramaic of the Dead Sea documents. Such inscriptions, then, can be used to date a document such as the Genesis Apocryphon. On the basis of a detailed study of the language of the Genesis Apocryphon in comparison with other dated materials, particularly the inscriptions mentioned, Kutscher dates the language of this particular document to the latter part of the first century B. C.[1] He also finds a resemblance between this dialect and that of Targum Onkelos and accordingly maintains a Palestinian--probably Judean--origin for Onkelos:

> The T. O. represented, like our scroll, R. [Reichsaramäisch] coloured by Western Aramaic. After the destruction of the Temple and the crushing of the Bar-Kochba revolt, which destroyed the cultural centres of Judaea, this literary style, a cross between R. and the Western Aramaic, died out, and instead the local spoken Western Aramaic dialects started to be used as means of literary expression and the Palestinian Targum came into being. But in Babylonia the language of the T. O. had always been a stranger, because of the western colour. Therefore the events in the west did not affect its position.[2]

It is to be noted that Kutscher, like Kahle, connects the Palestinian Targum with the local spoken dialect. However, he does not believe the Western dialects existed unchanged from the Christian era to the period for which they are attested--beginning with the fourth or, at the earliest, the third century A. D. Speaking of Western Aramaic, he distinguishes three dialects--Galilean Aramaic (Palestinian Talmud, Midrashim, Targums), Samaritan Aramaic, and Christian-Palestinian Aramaic, and states that "all of these reflect

---

1. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon," p. 22.

2. Ibid., p. 10, n. 44.

the linguistic situation of about the middle of the first millenium C. E."[1]

Joseph Fitzmyer accepts Kutscher's evaluation of the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon as "a transitional type between the Biblical Aramaic of Daniel and that of the Palestinian Targums or Christian Palestinian Aramaic. It belongs to what we prefer to call 'Middle Aramaic.'"[2] His classification of Aramaic dialects is helpful; it is in essential agreement with that of Kutscher although their terminologies are not identical:

(a) Old Aramaic: Inscriptions from N. Syria, 925-700 B. C.

(b) Official Aramaic: 700-300 B. C. Standardized and widespread throughout the Middle East. Includes language of Ezra.

(c) Middle Aramaic: 200 B. C. - A. D. 200. Development of dialects begins. (1) Palestine and Arabia: Includes language of Daniel, Nabatean, Qumrân, Murabba'ât, Palestinian inscriptions, quotations in Josephus and the New Testament, the beginnings of rabbinic literature. (2) Syria and Mesopotamia: Palmyra and Hatra, perhaps the beginnings of Babylonian rabbinical literature.

(d) Late Aramaic: A. D. 200-700 or later. The distinction between Western and Eastern Aramaic is clear in this period. The Western branch includes Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Samaritan, Palestinian Jewish Aramaic. The Eastern branch includes Syriac, Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, and Mandaic.

---

1. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon," p. 1.

2. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, p. 19.

(e) Modern Aramaic: Aramaic dialects still spoken in a few isolated villages.[1]

Members of the Kahle school have been disappointed in their hope for the appearance of a Dead Sea document clearly written in the "folk dialect" characteristic of the Palestinian Targum. The reversal of judgment on the Genesis Apocryphon made by Kahle himself has been described above.[2] Another example is the statement made by A. Diez Macho in 1959. He described the Dead Sea Aramaic documents already published as literary Aramaic "more or less developed" but expected materials of a different sort to appear:

> We have to wait until the publication of the Aramaic texts from Qumran--chiefly those of popular character--as contracts, letters and so on, to secure the real picture of the Palestinian Aramaic at the beginning of Christianity, that is to say a time close to the formation of PT. It is specially important to have published the Targum fragments to Leviticus and the Targum of Job, found in Qumran.[3]

Partial publication of the Targum of Job was later made, and its language revealed to be very close to that of the Book of Daniel. It was dated to the beginning of the first century B. C.[4] The Targum to Leviticus, still unpublished, is said to be quite literal, as is the Targum to Job.[5] In the light of these discoveries, Diez Macho has

---

1. A Western dialect is found in the Syrian villages of Maʿlûla, Jubbaʿdin, and Bahʿa, and an Eastern at Tûr Abdîn, between Lakes Urmia and Van, and north of Mosul in Iraq. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, pp. 19-20, n. 60; James D. Purvis, Review in Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XXVI (1967), 229-30.

2. Supra, p. 26, n. 1.

3. Diez Macho, "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," p. 238.

4. van der Woude, "Das Hiobtargum," p. 331.

5. McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum, p. 25.

now abandoned Kahle's position that Targum Onkelos is of late and Babylonian origin:

> El Onqelos, por otra parte, tiende a ser considerado como Targum, por lo menos en cuanto a su haggadá, palestinense. Si se confirman que el fragmentito del Targum literal descubierto en Qumran es un pre-Onqelos, tendríamos una prueba definitiva de la antigüedad extraordinaria de la traducción literal del Pentateuco y una prueba indirecta de la antigüedad--de la mayor antigüedad--del Targum palestinense.[1]

Diez Macho here apparently assumes that a freer translation resembling that of the Palestinian Targum must have preceded the literal rendition.[2] McNamara discounts these literal works as not in the mainstream of targumic tradition:

> This does not prove that the earlier Tgs were literal renderings while later ones were paraphrastic. We must remember that the Qumran Targums were for a more literate society than that for which the PT was intended. This latter arose in a liturgical milieu where paraphrasis was called for.[3]

The letters of Bar Kochba, referred to in Chapter I,[4] have been hailed by Diez Macho as evidence for the language of the Palestinian Targum. Kutscher is more cautious in making a judgment but is more inclined to relate them to Onkelos. That such a controversy is possible is an illustration of the fact that O and PT have certain common distinctive characteristics. Kahle's absolute

---

1. A. Diez Macho, "Targum y Nuevo Testamento," Mélanges Eugene Tisserant, Vol. I (Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1964), pp. 153-85.

2. It should be pointed out that a direct textual connection between Onkelos and the Qumrân Targum cannot be assumed simply because both are literal.

3. McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum, p. 25.

4. Supra, p. 31.

distinction between "literary" and "popular" language did not do justice to this fact.[1] It is unfortunate that these letters have a very limited vocabulary, because, as the empty space between Biblical Aramaic and the Western dialects has been filled in by the Dead Sea texts, it has become increasingly apparent that the Western dialects are separated from the dialects of the Genesis Apocryphon and of Targum Onkelos most of all by vocabulary. Even if one agrees with Kutscher that the language of the Palestinian Targum cannot safely be dated back to the first century A. D., such a different vocabulary must have a history involving some element other than the Imperial Aramaic which seems to be the ancestor of the Dead Sea texts. In view of the use in the Judean Bar Kochba letters of some forms agreeing with Onkelos (and Imperial Aramaic) against PT and PTM usage, the possibility must be considered that some of the elements that went into the making of the Western Aramaic dialects of the third or fourth century A. D. were originally Galilean but not Judean. It has been suggested that the Judean dialect may have been strongly influenced by Imperial Aramaic and by Hebrew, whereas the Galilean speech retained forms from an older, local Aramaic dialect and was also influenced by Greek.[2] The mixed character of Samaritan Aramaic--sometimes agreeing with the vocabulary of Onkelos, although more often with that of PT and PTM, might then be explained in relation to its geographical position.[3]

---

1. See Chapter III

2. This possibility was suggested to the writer by Prof. H. Neil Richardson.

3. See Chapter III.

5. 1956: Codex Neofiti 1

The announcement of the discovery of Neofiti 1 led to renewed interest in, and work upon, Palestinian Aramaic, described in Section 4 of Chapter I. Perhaps one of its most fruitful by-products was the confrontation between Kahle and Kutscher, in which opposing viewpoints were stated clearly. This vivid controversy made the scholarly world much more aware that the status of the Palestinian Aramaic dialects, and particularly of the Palestinian Targum, was far from settled and that, indeed, work on the language of the Targum had hardly begun.

This badly needed work is now well under way. The dissertations described in Chapter I all contributed to a better understanding of the language of the Palestinian Targum. Cowling's work in particular provided for the first time a systematic survey of the language of the Cairo Geniza texts. His entirely new theory, that PT is a translation of a Greek original, is the first explanation offered which is able simultaneously to account for the closeness of the language of PT to that of PTM and for its agreements with older material. As such it deserves serious consideration.

6. Conclusions

The writer has found a very noticeable difference in approach between the two main schools of thought in Palestinian Aramaic studies, that of Kahle and that of Kutscher. Kutscher, working with ancient manuscripts, has emphasized the need for use of dated material as a point of departure and has made a very detailed analysis of the small differences between rather similar dialects. As a result of this

detailed work, a continuum of development can now be seen between the Aramaic of Daniel and the Aramaic of Onkelos, with the language of the Genesis Apocryphon occupying an intermediate position and that of the Bar Kochba letters closely approaching that of Onkelos.

Kahle, on the other hand, had no ancient documents on which to base his early dating of the Palestinian Targum. The early date was based on certain readings believed to be pre-Christian and upon a reconstruction of the probable history of the development of the Targum. In the writer's opinion, Kutscher's criticism, that language cannot be dated by content, is entirely valid. Another statement of the same type of judgment is made by Fitzmyer:

> G. Vermes prefers [for the Genesis Apocryphon] an "earlier second century date . . . , mainly because of the freshness and simplicity of its haggadah, and because of its freedom from any sectarian bias." Neither of these reasons, however, is really valid for a date earlier than that suggested by Kutscher, for freshness and simplicity of haggadah and its freedom from any sectarian bias are scarcely objective norms which one can use for relative chronological dating.[1]

It is common for ideas to survive over a period of centuries, or to disappear and then reappear at a later date. Language, on the other hand, exhibits a regular progression. Therefore, in the following discussion, emphasis has been placed upon the relations of the dialects of the various Targums to other dialects of known dates.

---

1. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, p. 15.

CHAPTER III

A COMPARISON OF ARAMAIC DIALECTS

1. Introduction

The structure of the comparison of dialects presented in this chapter is based upon the list of contrasting "Targumic" and "Galilean" forms set forth by Gustaf Dalman.[1] In the "Targumic" column he has also included parallel forms from Biblical Aramaic, or noted their absence. In the "Galilean" column he includes Jerusalem Targum readings which differ from the usual forms of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim; he also adds the corresponding Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Samaritan Aramaic forms.

In the charts given below Dalman's terms, "Targumic" and "Galilean," have been replaced by the corresponding terms used by Stevenson, "OJ" for the language of Targums Onkelos and Jonathan and "PTM" for the language of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim.[2] It was felt that this terminology more clearly defined the source of the two language categories. Biblical Aramaic (BA) has been placed first in the listing. In general Dalman's listing for BA has been taken as it stands; where further clarification or subdivision was desired Bauer-Leander's grammar was consulted. Immediately following Biblical

---

1. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., pp. 44-51.

2. Stevenson, Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, 2nd ed., p. 3.

Aramaic, Qumrân Aramaic (QA) is given. Fitzmyer's grammatical summary and glossary, as described in Chapter I, is the source; his transcription and translation of the text are also consulted for further clarification of QA usage. Next in order is OJ, followed by four other targumic sources: Cairo Geniza (CG), Neofiti 1 (Ni), Fragment Targum (FT), and Pseudo-Jonathan (PJ). These listings replace Dalman's "Jerusalem Targum" category, as described below. Finally, the PTM forms, together with the correlated forms from Christian Palestinian Aramaic (CPA) and Samaritan Aramaic (SA) are given. CPA and SA have been given by Dalman in their proper native scripts; here they are transcribed into square script. The citations from OJ, PTM, CPA, and SA are all taken in general just as given by Dalman; for further clarification his fuller comparative tables at the end of the grammar have frequently been consulted,[1] as well as the appropriate sections within the body of the grammar. In addition Targum Onkelos has frequently been collated with the Hebrew in the same manner used for CG, Ni, FT and PJ; Sperber's edition was used as explained in Chapter I. In a few instances specific usages within the Samaritan Targum have also been traced by a similar method.[2]

As has been shown in Chapter II, Dalman based his evaluation of the language of the Palestinian Targum largely upon Pseudo-Jonathan,

---

1. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., pp. 395-411.

2. Sources used for Samaritan grammar and text were Frederick Uhlemann, Institutiones Linguae Samaritanae (Leipzig: Sumptibus et Typis Caroli Tauchnitii, 1837), and Adolph Brüll, ed., Das samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch (Frankfurt: Erras, 1875).

"Jeruschalmi I" in the terminology of that time, which was by far the most complete source then available. One of the chief purposes of the comparison made in this chapter is to re-evaluate Dalman's categorizing of the Palestinian Targum in the light of the Cairo Geniza and Neofiti 1 texts, which have been discovered since he wrote. It also seems desirable to list separately the Fragment Targums, Dalman's "Jeruschalmi II."[1] Therefore, Neofiti 1, the Fragment Targums, and Pseudo-Jonathan have been collated, for each citation, against the corresponding form in the Masoretic Text as cited in Mandelkern's concordance. For Cairo Geniza usage, Cowling's concordance has been consulted first; if CG usage is adequately understood from the concordance listing it is recorded as given there, but if not, CG readings where available are included in the MT collation along with Ni, FT and PJ. Regularly occurring marginal readings from Ni are noted, as are regularly occurring differences between the various CG and FT texts.

An attempt has been made to obtain as complete as possible a sampling of each form cited. For pronouns, nouns, adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions, a complete listing was made for those occurring relatively infrequently. For more frequently used words (more than 50 occurrences) a sampling was taken from every chapter of every book of the Pentateuch where found. Infrequently occurring

---

1. The older "Fragment Targum" category is used here for convenience. The recognition that VBNL comprise a single textual group, distinct from Paris 110, certainly seems valid. Similarly the Cairo Geniza texts differ considerably among themselves. Nevertheless there may be some usefulness, for linguistic study, in grouping together the comparatively early fragmentary MSS (CG) for comparison with the medieval MSS (FT).

verbs were collated completely. Common verbs were collated with emphasis on those forms which show differences between OJ and PTM; again, every book of the Pentateuch was included if represented. Each entry is headed with a Hebrew word or words and an English translation or definition. The Hebrew citations represent the forms from the Hebrew concordance used to locate readings in the Targums. The English definitions refer to the meanings of the Aramaic forms. In some cases the Aramaic usage represents a subdivision of Hebrew usage, so that the definition narrows the field covered by the Hebrew guide word (e.g., Hebrew לי and Aramaic דידי).

2. A Comparison of Dialects

i. Pronouns

"We," 1 c. pl.: אנחנו, נחנו

BA	אנחנא, אנחנה
QA	אנחנא
OJ	אנחנא, נחנא
CG	אנן
Ni	אנן, אנין (once), אנחנא (once), אנא (once)
FT	אנן
PJ	אנחנא, נחנא, אנן
PTM	אנן, נן
CPA	אנן, אנין, אנה
SA	אנן, אנחנן

The single appearance of אנחנא in Ni should be understood as a corruption from Onkelos. אנא may have some relation to the CPA form אנה or may simply be an error. PJ in contrast has אנחנא 21 times out of 35 occurrences. The usage of PJ is patterned: אנן first appears at Genesis 42:31 and is used regularly, with one exception, to the end of Genesis. Only four other uses of this particular form appear, one at Dt. 12:8 and three, curiously, in verses containing two uses of

"we," the first being given as אנחנא and the second as אנן (Ex. 10:26, 16:7,8; in the last two instances the second "we" is an expansion). Onkelos has נחנא only in the four instances where MT has נחנו; PJ agrees with two of these and also employs the short form in one other instance.

"They," 3 m. pl.: המה ,הם

BA	המו, המון, אנון
QA	אנון
OJ	אינון, הימון
CG	אנון, אינון; הנון, הינון (E, F)
Ni	אנון, אינון; הנון, הינון (M)
FT	הינון, אינון (P)
PJ	הינון, אינון
PTM	אינון, הינון
CPA	הנון, הינון
SA	אנון, הנון

הינון is by far the more common form in PJ.

"This," m. sg. demon.: הזה

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	הדין
CG	הדין, הדן
Ni	הדין, הדן
FT	הדין
PJ	הדין
PTM	הדין
CPA	הדין, הדן
SA	הדן

"This," f. sg. demon.: הזאת

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	הדא
CG	הדא (C), הדה (E)
Ni	הדה, הדא
FT	הדא
PJ	הדא
PTM	הדא
CPA	הדא
SA	הדה

C and E represent the extremes within the CG tradition in use of א and ה ; the other texts mix the two endings. Ni gives mixed readings for Genesis and Exodus, with the א ending more frequent; Leviticus provides only one example, but the numerous cases in Numbers and Deuteronomy show a shift to regular use of ה .

"That," m. sg. demon.: ההוא

---	BA
---	QA
ההוא	OJ
ההוא	CG
ההוא	Ni
ההוא	FT
ההוא	PJ
ההוא	PTM
האו , הו	CPA
ההוא	SA

"That," f. sg. demon.: ההיא

---	BA
---	QA
ההיא	OJ
ההיא	CG
ההיא, ההוא	Ni
ההיא	FT
ההיא	PJ
ההיא, האי	PTM
האי , הי , אהי	CPA
ההיא	SA

Abbreviated forms are found only in PTM and CPA. The occasional use of ההוא with feminine nouns in Ni may show influence from MT.

"Mine," possessive pronoun:

---	BA
(דילה)	QA
דילי	OJ
דידי	CG
דידי (דיליה)	Ni
דידי	FT
דילי (דידיה)	PJ
דילי , דידי	PTM
דילי	CPA
דילי	SA

The QA form is found only with prepositions preceding and probably corresponds to a Hebrew construction with אשר, whereas the other dialects regularly use these forms where Hebrew has only לי. The QA orthography as one word, however, may indicate a relationship to the later form. The Ni and PJ forms in parentheses are found in the expansion at Genesis 38:25. Each has here the opposite of its normal usage. CG texts D and E, which also preserve this expansion in varying forms, have the expected reading agreeing with over-all usage, as do the FT texts.

"Which," rel. pron.: אשר

BA	די
QA	די, ד
OJ	ד
CG	די, ד
Ni	די, ד
FT	די, ד
PJ	ד
PTM	ד
CPA	ד
SA	ד, די

"Which?", interrog. pron. (no real Hebrew correspondence; used occasionally where MT has מי)

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	(אידין, אידא)
CG	הידה (D), אידא (C)
Ni	הידין, הידה
FT	הידין, הידא
PJ	הי דין, הי דא
PTM	הידין, הידא, אידא
CPA	הידין
SA	---

The forms given beside OJ are not found in Onkelos, only in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, so that there is no direct correspondence of usage in the Pentateuch between O and the Palestinian Targums.

Noun used as reflexive pronoun

BA	---
QA	נפשא (f.)
OJ	נפשיה
CG	נפשיה
Ni	נפשיה
FT	נפשיה, גרמיה
PJ	נפשיה, גרמיה
PTM	גרמיה, נפשיה
CPA	גרמה
SA	נפשה

גרמיה, in frequent use in PTM, was cited by Dalman only for expanded passages in the Targums, five occurrences being listed for PJ (Lev. 7:29, 21:9; Num. 25:1; Dt. 3:11, 4:10) and one for FT (PVBN) (Lev. 10:20). None of the corresponding Ni verses contain identical expansions or this form; CG manuscripts are not extant for any of the verses. No instances were found of this form being used to translate Hebrew נפש with suffixes.

ii. Nominal Suffixes

"His," 3 m. sg. attached to pl. noun: יו

BA	והי
QA	והי
OJ	והי
CG	ול
Ni	וי, והי
FT	וי, והי
PJ	וי, והי
PTM	והי, וי
CPA	והי, וי
SA	יו

"Our," 1 c. pl. attached to sg. noun: נו

BA	נא, נה
QA	נא
OJ	נא
CG	ן; נן*
Ni	ן; ון, נא (seldom); נן*
FT	ן, נא (PBNL); נן*
PJ	נא, ן, יו; נן*
PTM	ן; נן*
CPA	ן; נן*
SA	ן; נן*

* Attached to nouns ending in a vowel

"Our," 1 c. pl. attached to pl. noun: ינו

BA	ינא
QA	---
OJ	נא
CG	ינן
Ni	ינן
FT	ינן, נא (PENL)
PJ	נא, ינן
PTM	ינן
CPA	ינין, ינה, ין
SA	ינן

iii. Adverbs

"Well": היטב

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	יאות
CG	יאות
Ni	יאות, טבאות; טבאות
FT	יאות, טבאות
PJ	טבאות, יאות
PTM	יאות, טבאות
CPA	יאות
SA	טבהאית, אשפיר

"Little": מעט

BA	זעיר
QA	---
OJ	זעיר
CG	קליל, זעיר
Ni	קליל, זעיר
FT	קליל, זעיר
PJ	קליל, זעיר
PTM	צבחד
CPA	צינחד
SA	צינבעד, צינבעת

A combined form, קליל זעיר, appears in Ni, CG (E), FT and PJ.

"Very, Much": מאוד

BA	שגיא
QA	שגיא, שגי, לחדא
OJ	לחדא, סגי (seldom)
CG	לחדה, לחדא (F)
Ni	לחדא, לחדה
FT	לחדא, אסגין
PJ	לחדא, סגי (seldom)
PTM	סגין, סגי
CPA	לחדא, סגיאית
SA	שביב, אסגי

"Now": עתה

BA	כען
QA	כען
OJ	כען
CG	כדון
Ni	כדון; כען, כדו, כדן (occasionally); M כדו
FT	כדון, כדו (VBN)
PJ	כדון; כען (occasionally)
PTM	כדון, כדו
CPA	כדו
SA	כדו

"Still, Again": עוד

BA	עוד
QA	עוד
OJ	עוד
CG	עוד; תוב, תובן (D and F)
Ni	תוב, עוד; M עוד
FT	עוד, תוב (P)
PJ	תוב, עוד, עדן (once)
PTM	עוד, תובן
CPA	תובן, עוד, חוד
SA	עוד, חובי, עובי, אובי

"Yesterday": תמול

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	אתמלי
CG	אתמל
Ni	אתמל, אתמול, אתמיל, איתמיל
FT	איתמול
PJ	איתמלי, אתמלי
PTM	אתמל
CPA	אתמל
SA	אתמל, תמל

"Where?": אי, איה, איכה

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	אן
CG	הן (E), אן (B)
Ni	אן, הן; M הן
FT	הן, אן
PJ	האן, אן
PTM	הן
CPA	הן
SA	אהן, האן

"Why?": למה

BA	(על מה)
QA	למא
OJ	למא
CG	למה כען
Ni	למה כען, למה (M כען)
FT	למה כען, למא כען (P)
PJ	למא, למה, למא כען (once)
PTM	למה
CPA	למא
SA	למה

"Wherefore?" (Dt. 29:23 only instance in Pent.): על-מה

BA	על מה
QA	---
OJ	על מא
CG	---
Ni	למה
FT	---
PJ	מסול מה
PTM	בגין מא
CPA	---
SA	על מה

"Wherefore?": מדוע

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	מדין
CG	מן בגלל מה
Ni	מן בגלל מה
FT	מן בגלל מה, מידבר בגלל מה (VBM, expansion)
PJ	מדין, מה דין, למא דין
PTM	---
CPA	---
SA	ממה

"Therefore": על כן

BA	(כל קבל דנה)
QA	---
OJ	על כן/כין
CG	בגין כן (E), מן בגין כן (E, F), בגין כדין (C), בגין כדן (B), מן בגין כדן (F)
Ni	בגין כדין, בגין כן (once); M (מן) בגין כן
FT	(מן) בגין כן, בגין כדין, על כין
PJ	בגין כן, על כן, מטול כן, מטול היכנא (expansion)
PTM	בגין כן
CPA	לגלל כדן, לבדל כדין
SA	על כן, בדיל כן

"Therefore": לכן

BA	(כל קבל דנה)
QA	---
OJ	בכין, לכן (once, Genesis 4:15)
CG	בשבועה
Ni	בשבועה, בגין כדין; M בשבועה, לכן (once)
FT	בשבועה
PJ	בכן, בגין כן, בשבועה (once)
PTM	---
CPA	לכן
SA	לכן

The five preceding categories were broken down from Dalman's original two when it was discovered that the various synonyms given for "why" and "therefore" were not interchangeable in the Targums, but corresponded to particular Hebrew words. For placement of the words from the non-Targumic sources the more extensive adverb table at the back of the grammar was used.

"Thus": כן

BA	כן, כדנה
QA	כדן, כדנא
OJ	כן, כדין, כדנן
CG	כן (E), כדין (D), כדן
Ni	כדן, כדין, כן; M כן
FT	כין (VBN); כדין, כדנן (P)
PJ	כן, כדין
PTM	כן, כדין, היכדין
CPA	כדין, כדן, כן, הכדין, הכדן
SA	כדן, כן, הכה, אכהן

iv. Prepositions

"As": כ

BA	כ, הא כ (once)
QA	כ
OJ	כ, כות
CG	כ, כות
Ni	כ, כות
FT	כ, כוות
PJ	כ, כות, הי כ, היך
PTM	כ, כוות, כגון
CPA	כות
SA	כ, כות

"To": ל, אל

BA	ל, לות
QA	ל, לואת
OJ	ל, לות
CG	ל, לות
Ni	ל, לות
FT	ל, לוות
PJ	ל, לות
PTM	ל, לגב
CPA	ל, לות, לגיב, גף, על
SA	ל, לות, לוי, ליד

"Before": לפני

BA	קדם
QA	קודם, קדמת
OJ	קדם
CG	קדם (ABCD), קודם (EF)
Ni	קדם, קודם (seldom)
FT	קדם, קודם (VBNL), קומי (P)
PJ	קדם, קודם, קומי, קמי
PTM	קדם, קמי, קומי
CPA	קודם, אפי
SA	קדם, קודם, קמי, על אפי

"On account of, Because of": בעבור, למען, בגלל

BA	על דברת
QA	בדיל
OJ	בדיל, בגלל
CG	בגלל, מן בגלל, בזכות
Ni	בגלל, מן בגלל, בזכות
FT	מן בגלל
PJ	מן בגלל, בגין, בגין זכות, בדיל, מטול, אמטול
PTM	בגין, בדיל
CPA	בדיל, לבדיל, לגלל, לגילל, על טב, לטב, מטל (once)
SA	בדיל, בגלל, מבגלל

v. Conjunctions

"Because, For": כי

BA	כל קבל די
QA	ארי
OJ	ארי, בדיל ד
CG	ארום, מן בגלל ד, מן קדם ד, בגין (exp.)
Ni	ארום, מן בגלל ד, בגין (exp.)
FT	ארום, מן קדם ד, בגין ד (exp.), ארי (VBN, seldom)
PJ	ארום, מן בגלל ד, בגין ד, מטול ד
PTM	בגין ד
CPA	לגלל, מן לגלל
SA	על ד, כד, במטי, הלא, מה

"That": כי

BA	די
QA	די, ד
OJ	ארי
CG	ארום
Ni	ארום, ארי (seldom)
FT	ארום, ארי (VBNL, seldom)
PJ	ארום, ארי (seldom)
PTM	ד
CPA	ד
SA	ד, די, הן, הלא

"As": כאשר

BA	הא כדי
QA	---
OJ	כמה ד
CG	היך/הך מה/א די/ד; הכמה די (F), היך די (E)
Ni	היך מה די/ד; כמה ד, היך ד (seldom)
FT	היך מה/א די/ד, היך ד
PJ	היכמא ד, הי כמא ד, כמא ד
PTM	היכמה ד, כמה ד, היך ד
CPA	היך ד, היך מא ד
SA	כמה ד, הך די

"But, Except": כי אם

BA	להן
QA	להן
OJ	אלהין
CG	ארום אלא הן, ברם אלא הן, ארום אלהין, אילא (exp.)
Ni	ארום אלהן, אלהן (seldom); M (ארום) אלא הן
FT	ארום אילהין, אילהין
PJ	אלהן, אלהין, ארום אלהן (seldom)
PTM	אלא
CPA	אלא, אלא אן
SA	אלא, הלא, אלא אם

"If": אם

BA	הן
QA	אן, הן
OJ	אם
CG	אין, אן, אם (F once)
Ni	אן, אין, אם
FT	אין, אם
PJ	אין, אם
PTM	אין, אי
CPA	אן, אין
SA	אם, אן

vi. Interjections

"Please": נא

BA	---
QA	נה
OJ	כען, בבעו
CG	כען, בבעו
Ni	כען, בבעו; M בבעו
FT	כען, בבעו
PJ	כדון, כען (seldom); בבעו, במטו
PTM	בבעו
CPA	---
SA	שבי, שוי, בעו

"O that...": לו

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	לוי
CG	לוי, לווי
Ni	אלווי, לווי; M לווי
FT	אלווי
PJ	הלואי, לואי
PTM	הלואי
CPA	---
SA	לוי

vii. Verb Forms (Distinguishing Terminations and Prefixes)

Perfect 3 m. pl.

BA	ו
QA	ו; ון (Lamedh Aleph verbs)
OJ	ו
CG	ו; ון (ו once) third radical weak
Ni	ו; ון (ו sometimes) third radical weak
FT	ו; ון (ו sometimes) third radical weak
PJ	ו; ון (seldom, with third radical weak)
PTM	ון
CPA	ו, ון (seldom)
SA	ו

Perfect 3 f. pl.

BA	ה
QA	א
OJ	א
CG	ן, ין
Ni	ן, ין
FT	ן, א
PJ	א, ן
PTM	ן
CPA	ן
SA	ן, ין, ן

Perfect 1 c. pl.

BA	נא
QA	נא, נה
OJ	נא
CG	נן
Ni	נן, נא (seldom)
FT	נן, נא (seldom)
PJ	נא, נן
PTM	נן, ן
CPA	נה, נן
SA	נן, נא, ן

Imperative f. pl.

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	ן
CG	---
Ni	ן
FT	---
PJ	ן
PTM	ן
CPA	ן, נן, י
SA	ין, ן

Infinitive

Only Infin. Peal with prefix	מ	BA
" " " " "	מ	QA
" " " " "	מ	OJ
All Infinitives with prefix	מ	CG
" " " " "	מ	Ni
" " " " "	מ	FT
Usually only Infin. Peal with prefix	מ	PJ
All Infinitives with prefix	מ	PTM
Avoids Infinitives		CPA
All Infin. often with prefix	מ	SA

viii. Nouns and Verbs (Vocabulary)

"Blood": דם

BA	---
QA	דם
OJ	דם
CG	אדם
Ni	אדם, דם
FT	אדם (P); אידם, דם (VBN)
PJ	דם, אדם
PTM	אדם
CPA	אדם
SA	דם, אדם

"To Meet": מצא

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	ערע
CG	ארע
Ni	ארע, ערע
FT	---
PJ	ערע, ארע
PTM	ארע
CPA	אורע
SA	ארע

"Sick": באש

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	מרע
CG	ביש
Ni	ביש
FT	---
PJ	מרע
PTM	ביש
CPA	באש
SA	בהאש

"To Commit Adultery": נאף

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	גוף
CG	גור
Ni	גור
FT	---
PJ	גור
PTM	גור
CPA	גור
SA	גור

"To Laugh": צחק

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	חייך
CG	תמה
Ni	גחך, תמה; M דחך
FT	גחך, חייך, תמה
PJ	גחך, תמה
PTM	גחך
CPA	גחך
SA	חיך, תמה

"Bank, Shore": סְפָה

BA	---
QA	יד ימא
OJ	כיף
CG	גף
Ni	גיף, גף, כף
FT	גיף, גף
PJ	גיף, כיף
PTM	גיף
CPA	יאד ימא
SA	ספת ימא

"Moon": יָרֵחַ

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	סיהר
CG	---
Ni	זהר, סהר
FT	---
PJ	סיהר, זיהר
PTM	זיהר
CPA	זהר
SA	זער

"To Return": שׁוּב

BA	תוב
QA	תוב
OJ	תוב
CG	חזר, תוב (D once)
Ni	חזר, תוב (seldom); M חזר
FT	חזר, תוב (P)
PJ	תוב, הדר (seldom)
PTM	חזר, תוב
CPA	תוב
SA	תוב, עזר

"To Know": יָדַע

BA	ידע
QA	ידע
OJ	ידע
CG	ידע, חכם
Ni	ידע, חכם
FT	ידע, חכם
PJ	ידע, חכם (seldom)
PTM	חכם, ידע
CPA	ידע
SA	ידע, חכם

"To Flay, Strip": פשט, הפשיט

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	שלח
CG	שלח (D)
Ni	שלח; M חלש
FT	חלש
PJ	שלח
PTM	שלח, חלש
CPA	חלש
SA	שלח, שלע

"To See": ראה

BA	חזא
QA	חזא
OJ	חזא
CG	חמה, חמא
Ni	חמא, חזא (seldom, expansion)
FT	חמא
PJ	חמא
PTM	חמא
CPA	חמא
SA	חזה, עמה

"To Be Finished, Gone": תמם, אפס, כלה

BA	שלם
QA	שלם
OJ	שלם
CG	שלם, חסל
Ni	שלם; M חסל
FT	שלם, חסל
PJ	שלם, פסק
PTM	חסל
CPA	---
SA	שלם, עסל

"To Carve": פסל

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	פסל
CG	חצב
Ni	חצב
FT	חצב
PJ	פסל, חצב
PTM	חצב
CPA	חצב
SA	פסל

"To Go Away": הלך, התהלך

BA	הלך	Pa.	יהך	Peal Impf. אזל
QA	הלך	Pa.	יהך	Peal Impf. אזל
OJ	הלך	Pa.	יהך	Peal Impf. אזל
CG	הלך	Pa.	אזל	
Ni	הלך	Pa.	אזל; M טייל	
FT	אזל, טייל			
PJ	הלך	Pa.	יהך	Peal Impf. אזל, טייל
PTM	הלך	Pa.	אזל, טייל	
CPA	הלך	Pa.	אזל	
SA	הלך	Pa.	יהך	Peal Impf. אזל

"Boy": נער, ילד

BA	---
QA	עולים
OJ	רבי, עולים
CG	טלי, רבי (F exp.)
Ni	טלי; עולם, רבי (seldom); M טלי
FT	טלי
PJ	טלי, רבי, עולים
PTM	טלי
CPA	טלי, עולים (seldom)
SA	רבי, טלי, עולים, יליד

"Girl": נערה, ילדה, עלמה

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	עולימה
CG	רביתא (C)
Ni	רביתה; M טליתה
FT	טליתא
PJ	עולימה, טליתא; ריבא (Genesis only)
PTM	טליתא (טליה)
CPA	טליתא
SA	עלימה

"To Throw": השליך

BA	רמא
QA	רמה
OJ	רמא
CG	טלק
Ni	טלק, רמה (seldom); M קלק
FT	טלק, קלק
PJ	טלק, רמא (seldom), קלק (once)
PTM	טלק, קלק
CPA	---
SA	רמה, טלק

"Bag": אמתח

BA	---
QA	---
OJ	טוען
CG	טעון, טען
Ni	טעון
FT	---
PJ	טון
PTM	טעון, מובל
CPA	מובל
SA	מסבל

"Heap": גל, חמר

BA	יגר
QA	---
OJ	דגור (= גל, חמר)
CG	יגר (= גל)
Ni	איגר (= גל), כרי (= חמר)
FT	כרי (= חמר)
PJ	אוגר (= גל), כרי (= חמר)
PTM	כרי
CPA	---
SA	כרי

"Seven": שבע

BA	שבע
QA	שבע
OJ	שבע
CG	שבע, שובע
Ni	שבע
FT	שבע, שובע
PJ	שבע, שב
PTM	שבע
CPA	שובע
SA	שבע

"Twelve": שנים עשר

BA	תרי עשר
QA	תרתי עשרה
OJ	תרין עשר/עסר, תרי עשר/עסר
CG	תרי עשר
Ni	תרין עשר; M תרי עשר
FT	תרי עשר, תרי עסר
PJ	תרי סר
PTM	תרין עשר
CPA	תריעסר, תרעסר
SA	תרין עסר, תרי עסר

3. Conclusions

A considerable number of factors must be considered in order to evaluate the nature of the languages of the various Targums. Major variables which come readily to mind are:

i. Origin of the translation and nature of language used.

ii. Date.

iii. Place: (1) Palestine vs. Babylon; (2) Judea vs. Galilee.

These factors are closely interrelated, and it is impossible to make a judgment on any one without taking the others into account. Nevertheless, an analysis subdivided into these categories may serve to clarify specific issues.

i. Origin of the Translation

One of the most generally accepted ideas about the Palestinian Targum has been that it lacked a fixed text, having developed over a period of centuries from the free interpretations given in the synagogues.[1] However, the comparative data cited above give support to the view that an original single translation underlies the texts of Neofiti 1 text and margin, the Vatican 440 group, Paris 110, and all the Cairo Geniza texts.

This judgment is based upon the consistent employment of different, specific Aramaic words or phrases to translate specific Hebrew synonyms, and upon the common use by these manuscripts of words

---

1. This was Paul Kahle's interpretation. Supra, p. 54.

or phrases not precisely duplicated by the other dialects included in the table.

The most striking single examples, which combine these two factors, are the translation words used for the three Hebrew forms of "why?" and the two forms of "therefore." O and PT here have clearly defined and entirely distinct ways of indicating the various Hebrew words. PJ agrees most often with O, on two single occasions reproduces the PT form, and also employs forms involving the Babylonian word מטול .

Of particular interest is the translation by PT of Hebrew על כן and לכן by בגין כן (מן) and בשבועה respectively. בשבועה has been found in a Galilean inscription of the third century A. D. and thus is indisputably Galilean. It is difficult to imagine, however, that the precise and strong distinction made by PT was inherent in the spoken language. Every other usage given in the table, except for one unusual form found in PJ, involves כדין or כן. It seems most likely that the normal Galilean usage corresponding to both לכן and על כן was בגין כן, and that בשבועה is a deliberate and "literary" translation convention.

Other examples of distinctive translations used by PT regularly and by PJ either regularly or occasionally are:

קליל	for MT	מעט
מן בגלל	for MT	בעבור, למען, בגלל
מן בגלל ד	for MT	כי
ארום אלהן	for MT	כי אם

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 211.

Although PJ, in the preceding examples, uses words otherwise peculiar to the Palestinian Targum, and in addition employs a large number of words typical of both the Palestinian Targum and the Galilean rabbinic literature, there are many reasons for placing it in a category separate from that of the Palestinian Targum. In basic formations such as pronominal suffixes, verb endings, and the formation of infinitives, it follows Onkelos in the majority of cases. Furthermore, as Cowling has pointed out,[1] although PJ employs many Galilean words it ignores differential distributions in which one Hebrew word is translated by two Aramaic words, or one Aramaic word renders two Hebrew words. One example used by Cowling is the failure of PJ to distinguish ידע and חכם systematically.[2] Investigation for this chapter revealed further that PJ never employs חכם to translate the Hebrew Hiphil form הכר, although this usage is absolutely regular in PT, but uses instead אשתמודע, the regular Onkelos translation. Another example involves the forms translating Hebrew השליך and שפך. PT quite regularly uses טלק/קלק for the former and שפך for the latter, while O uses רמא for השליך but employs three words, רמא, שדא and נפך, to translate שפך. PJ follows PT in the first use; in translating שפך it does not follow O consistently, but also uses a variety of forms, including טלק.

Distinctions of usage of this type, involving not simple one-to-one correspondences of Hebrew and Aramaic but more complex clusters of

---

1. Thesis, p. 250.

2. Ibid., p. 155.

related words, show a consistent pattern for the entire PT tradition in a majority of instances, distinct from that presented by O and PJ. PJ sometimes follows O, sometimes presents an extremely varied mixture of forms, and in some instances uses words which are not found in the other targum traditions at all, being typical instead of the Palestinian or Babylonian rabbinic writings of the Talmud and Midrash.

In those cases where PJ corresponds to a complex pattern (as opposed to a single word) in another targum, it always agrees with O rather than PT. A good example is the usage for the predicate pronoun "mine":

	O	PJ	Mi	Mi M	CG	FT
Gen. 31:43	דילי	דילי	לי	דידי	דידי	
48:5	דילי	דילי	לשמי			
Ex. 13:2	דילי	דילי	לשמי			
19:5	דילי	קדמי	דידי		לשמי	לשמי
34:19	דילי	דילי	לשמי			לשמי
Lev. 20:26	קדמי	קדמי	לשמי			
25:23	דילי	דילי	דידי			
Num. 3:12	קדמי	קדמי	לשמי			
3:13	דילי	דילי	לשמי			
3:45	קדמי	קדמי	לשמי			
8:14	קדמי	קדמי	לשמי			
8:17	דילי	דילי	לשמי			

O and PT here follow entirely different translation patterns. An examination of the passages in question shows that PT uses לשמי for all living beings, whether the speaker is God (as in most cases) or

a human being (Gen. 48:5), employing כולי only for inanimate or abstract things--"earth," "land," "all." O, in contrast uses כולי except where an active service of God is involved, the word קדמי referring usually to the Levites and in one case to the "people" (Lev. 20:26). PJ diverges from O in only one instance, Exodus 19:5. PJ and the various versions of PT have varying expansions here, and the witnesses for FT (PVBN) and CG (F) disagree with Ni. The other PT disagreement involves a secondary revision in the text of Ni which brings it into conformity with the Hebrew. The marginal reading and one CG witness (C) preserve the original word.

The writer has concluded that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is dependent upon Targum Onkelos. The writer of PJ has supplemented the Onkelos version with material from the Palestinian Targum and from other sources, and, in addition, has altered the language of Onkelos considerably, replacing Onkelos words with Palestinian words. The relationship in a rather subtle language pattern described above requires some direct relationship between O and PJ. The judgment that PJ depends upon O, and not O upon PJ or both upon some third source, is dictated by the writer's observations on the nature of the language of the three Targums.

An attempt has been made to give the most simple and straightforward explanation for the makeup of each Targum. In the view of the writer, both Onkelos and the Palestinian Targums are most simply understood as direct translations, the first from Hebrew, the second from Greek. The writer contends that simple translation, rendering a particular Hebrew or Greek word regularly with a particular Aramaic

word, is the easiest and most obvious method of setting down in writing a version for which the original is not only available but omnipresent. The use of the Masoretic text by Onkelos would thus be entirely understandable. The employment of a Greek translation for such a purpose is a little more difficult to explain and could indicate that the Palestinian Targum came from non-official circles. This would also help to explain its development into a variety of recensions, contrasting with the fixing of the text of Onkelos.

The objection may be raised that the Palestinian Targum is not consistent in its translation usage, but shows as great a variety as Pseudo-Jonathan, and that this variety--in both cases--is a sign of the colloquial, "folk" character of these versions, contrasted with the regularized--and therefore later--rendition of Onkelos. It is true that, if all witnesses to the Palestinian Targum are taken together and compared with Pseudo-Jonathan, the variety in orthography and vocabulary is nearly as great. The fragmentary character of the PT witnesses has encouraged just such comparison, which is entirely unjustified since it places thirteen versions of PT against two versions of PJ. Furthermore, the two sources for PJ (manuscript and editio princeps) seem to represent a single recension, comparable to the four members of the Vatican 440 group--but not to the six Cairo Geniza texts, which differ widely among themselves. The writer maintains that any one text of the Palestinian Targum shows a translation usage very nearly as regular as that of Onkelos. This is particularly true of the Cairo Geniza manuscripts. Most of the variation in PT is between recensions, not within them. This

variation can be understood in large part as due to deliberate revision.[1]

This leaves the question of the language of Pseudo-Jonathan, which does show great variety within a single recension. Although inconsistency, particularly in orthography, is undoubtedly a characteristic of "natural" writing, in contrast to the greater care and consistency of a professional scribe, the inconsistency of Pseudo-Jonathan is so great that it indicates, not that the language is natural, but that it is unnatural. It is difficult to believe, for example, that the repeated use of two forms of the first person plural pronoun, one archaic and the other more recent, together in the same sentence, is a normal dialectical trait. Many instances of this sort prohibit the understanding of PJ as a collection of traditions from different times and places; too many forms never found together elsewhere are inextricably intermixed.

The view taken here has been criticized by Geza Vermes:

> lJ /PJ/ consists of O supplemented by extracts from the PTs. This view was held by G. Dalman, Paul Kahle, and is still expressed by P. Grelot. . . . It becomes abundantly clear that the first hypothesis is untenable. lJ possesses throughout, even in translation, its own linguistic individuality, and is never a mere copy of O. Such a theory would demand not only a midrashic supplementation of O from Palestinian sources, but also an incomplete accommodation of the O language to the Palestinian Aramaic dialect. A phenomenon of this kind, as Diez Macho has aptly pointed out, is most unlikely. "A simply linguistic 'palestinization' of O," he writes, "seems to be historically impossible, because the historical linguistic process is to spread . . . the language of O in the Palestinian Targums, and it seems particularly impossible in connexion with O, because when

1. Infra, pp. 101-103.

> O was introduced in Palestine, the colloquial Palestinian Aramaic had already vanished.[1]

It is certainly correct that PJ is not a simple supplementation of O from PT, and that the writer does show a high degree of individuality in his use of material (from a variety of sources in addition to PT), which he edits or rearranges as he wishes. The "linguistic individuality," apparent in translation, in the original seems not just individual but confusingly inconsistent. In the writer's view the linguistic situation found in PJ can only be explained by just such an hypothesis as the one which Diez Macho has labeled "unlikely." As for the final objection, the writer agrees that the writer of PJ could not have been a speaker of colloquial Palestinian Aramaic. He ignores the subtle and complex aspects of the dialect, although he faithfully reproduces some of the most obvious ones, as well as a number of unusual words. One must conclude that the writer of PJ was attempting to produce a Targum in a Palestinian dialect no longer in existence which he did not himself fully understand. This is, of course, an eccentric and complicated procedure, running against the mainstream of influence of O upon PT. The writer cannot find any more straightforward explanation which adequately explains the makeup of this Targum, however.

An additional check was made on the relation of the language of PJ to that of PT by examining the collection of words cited by Dalman[2] as evidence for the late and mixed character of the "Jerusalem Targum." Of the words described as common between the "Jerusalem

---

1. Vermes, "The Targumic Versions of Genesis IV 3-16," pp. 97-98.
2. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., p. 32.

Targum" and the Babylonian Talmud, all were discovered in the translation language of PJ in at least one instance (some, notably forms with מטול, are much more common in the additional material in PJ). Only one, רביתה, was found in PT. It is attested by one instance in CG manuscript C, and is the regular usage of the Ni text, while the margin regularly reads טליתה. The form is somewhat different from that of PJ, ריבא. Furthermore, while Neofiti uses the word regularly throughout the entire manuscript, usage in PJ is confined to Genesis. Thus, the Neofiti use suggests a wholesale revision from the original טליתה to a later (and perhaps originally Babylonian) רביתה, while the unusual pattern of use found in PJ, like the pattern found for אנחנא and אנן, suggests a use of multiple sources.

The words which Dalman cites as absent in the "Jerusalem Targum," although typical of Galilean Aramaic, are also absent from the PT tradition. The word he describes as occurring only in the "Jerusalem Targum," שרגג, is now attested not only by PJ but by Ms A of the Cairo Geniza, the oldest of all the fragments. Ni uses a different word and no marginal notation is given (Ex. 22:15). A comparison of PJ and A did not reveal any further variants against Ni or any general pattern of agreement, reinforcing the impression of a selective source such as a commentary as the basis of the PT words in PJ.

Among the Babylonian usages of PJ, one of the most consistent and interesting was the employment of the abbreviated forms of all the numbers from eleven to nineteen. This was the most extensive consistent use within the translation material of forms differing from both

O and PT that was discovered in this survey. A further systematic study of the vocabulary of PJ is outside the scope of this dissertation, but it seems obvious that a full description of its usages would involve a study not only of the language of Targum Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum but of both Talmuds and the Targums to the Writings as well. Several interesting correspondences with the last mentioned sources were noted in Jastrow.

The opinion has already been expressed that the Palestinian Targum in all its forms stems from a single original translation. The simplest explanation for Targum Onkelos also, in view of its regular and consistent translation language and its fidelity to the Masoretic Text, is that it is a direct translation of that text. There would, in this view, be no direct connection between the two translations, and no earlier Targum directly underlying both. The correspondences that are found, both in language usage and in specific readings, can be understood as reflecting a common oral translation tradition. There is a possibility that the paraphrases found occasionally in Onkelos as well as in the Palestinian Targum, either because of the poetic character of the original or its theological difficulty, preserve language elements earlier than the common usage of either Targum. For example, the paraphrase of Genesis 4:23, the Song of Lamech, found in varying forms in O, PT, PJ and Bereshit Rabba, translates MT ילד with עולימ. This word, found only here in PT and uncommon in Onkelos, is the normal term of the first-century Genesis Apocryphon. Another possible example is the use of דם in Genesis 49:11. The Neofiti text, which seems to have preserved

the original forms here, has דם twice, while the Fragment Targums and Pseudo-Jonathan have אדם or אידם. It could, of course, be argued that the "original" reading of Neofiti is a corruption or correction from the language of Onkelos. However, it could not be a direct correction from the corresponding verse of Onkelos, which gives an entirely different paraphrase and does not use the word "blood."

The greater part of the Onkelos version, then, can be understood as a direct translation of MT. This opinion applies specifically to the literal translation language, leaving open the question of earlier or later sources for any paraphrastic or additional material. It does not, of course, rule out the likelihood of a standardizing process resulting in the publication of an "official" text in the fifth century A. D., or preclude the possible existence of varying versions which were eliminated. It does assume a relatively limited variation.

The writer does not consider it at all likely that Onkelos was produced by editing a less literal Palestinian Targum or Targums, since such a procedure would be more complex than simply using the available MT. It is conceivable that Onkelos was a new edition of an older literal Targum, like those at Qumrân. It is also possible that Onkelos once contained a fuller exposition of difficult passages than the brief and sometimes cryptic allusions now found.

As stated in Chapter I, Cowling's argument for a Greek translation behind PT has been accepted. It does not necessarily follow that the language of PT is as "Greek" as that of CPA, since the latter translates a Greek original while the former is a translation of a translation

which had as its chief goal the accurate reproduction of the meaning of the Hebrew text.

Although no attempt was made in preparing this study to locate correspondences to the Greek translations, a few readings were discovered which could be interpreted in that way. They are:

Numbers 24:23: Mi text and VBH read אלוריי in agreement with LXX Ω ὠ, against C, PJ, P, and Mi M.

Genesis 28:21: Mi margin reads ויחזר יתי in agreement with LXX against C, PJ (ואתוב), E and Mi text (ואחזר).

Deuteronomy 22:23, 28: Mi text reads רבי apparently with LXX παῖς, against C, PJ (עולימתא) and Mi margin (טלייה).

Another interesting usage which diverges from the Hebrew text could not be connected to any Greek text. This is the regular employment of האלין with עמא. It is found in both Mi text and Mi margin; the marginal reading occurs twice, giving the distinctive morphology of the E type, האליין. CG Ms E, which usually agrees with Mi M, provides no examples of this form but uses the expected form הדין, as does Ms D. VBHL and P, on the other hand, agree with Mi text and margin. All the evidence cited above involves a direct correspondence to Hebrew הזה. Another example found in an expanded verse, where it does not directly parallel the Hebrew, gives a somewhat different distribution: At Exodus 15:16 Mi text, VBH, and PJ (which has no instance of this use in its translation) read האלין; by inserting the corresponding reading into the Baars text we are able to fill the lacuna which only the lamedh has survived. P, on the other hand, reads דנן with Onkelos. It should

be noted that this is another example where the usage of a poetic paraphrase differs from the normal translation use: Pseudo-Jonathan has a Palestinian reading not found in its translation, and Onkelos employs a form older than its customary usage (Paris 110 has probably been revised by Onkelos and therefore is not an independent witness).

Although this unusual usage is not attested by the oldest manuscripts, the Cairo Geniza group (the manuscript published by Baars seems to be later and closer to Neofiti)[1] it is probably an original reading. The agreement of the text of Neofiti with its margin, with which it more often disagrees, and also with all the Fragment Targum manuscripts, makes it unlikely that the reading is a revision. It would also be very difficult to understand as a revision directly away from the reading of the Masoretic text and of Onkelos, when the general trend of revision is in the other direction. Finally, although such a formation seems grammatically peculiar, the underlying logic of a plural demonstrative with a collective noun is perfectly understandable. If this is an original reading, since no corresponding form has been found in the Greek, it seems likely that it reflects Palestinian Aramaic usage at some particular time or place.

Returning to the three readings corresponding to the Greek text: it is true that, taken individually, these could just as well be understood as evidence for dependence on a variant Hebrew text. Taken together with the general evidence for the date of the language given below, and with evidence for a translation from a Greek version,

---

1. Supra, p. 14, n. 3.

these readings seem best understood as additional evidence for the dependence of this Targum upon a Greek translation.

Since the concept of the Palestinian Targum as an individual translation has been adopted, its numerous variations must be regarded as subsequent to its original translation. It is certainly evident that the PT had no "fixed text" paralleling that of Onkelos but continued to be revised and added to rather freely for a long time. The history of the additions in particular is quite complex, although Cowling sees a pattern of increasing length and number of additions, with the "best" texts such as C3 Ms E having the smallest amount of added material.[1]

It is obvious, however, that the variation did have some limits. No tendency to replace the translation with free paraphrase is found, and the variations made in the translation, although numerous, quickly assume an orderly pattern in the type of general survey made for this chapter. This is particularly obvious in the early C3 texts and also in the differences between Mi text and margin (although the text has further secondary variations and revisions). The variants in PT appear in pairs (occasionally three forms are found), and a given manuscript, particularly a C3 manuscript, consistently uses one of the two forms throughout. The choices between forms, however, are somewhat independent of each other, so that the different manuscripts present different combinations. This fact, together with the considerable individuality of orthography of different scribes, the

---

1. Thesis, opening Summary.

corruptions of the later manuscripts, the inclusion of PJ as a member of the group, and the concentration of many scholars on the passages containing extensive additions, led to a portrayal of the language of the Palestinian Targums as displaying endless and unpredictable variety.

It is maintained here, however, that most of the variants regularly occurring within the PT tradition are deliberate revisions. In most pairs, one variant agrees with Onkelos. The conclusion that the variants are directly related to the text of Onkelos, or even to the language of Onkelos as a whole, however, is premature. The patterning of variants from one manuscript to another suggests a different conclusion. Listed below are the variant pairs which present a contrast between CG Ms E or Ni M and any other manuscript or manuscripts, compared further with the usages of Onkelos and of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim.

Ms.E	Others	Onkelos	PTM
הינון	אינון	אינון, הימון	אינון, הינון
היך די	היך מה די	כמה ד	היך ד, היכמה ד,
עוד	תוב	עוד	עוד, תובן|כמה ד
הן	אן	אן	הן
כן	כדין	כן, כדין	כן, כדין, היכדין
קודם	קדמ, קומי	קדם	קדם, קומי
חזר	תוב	תוב	חזר, תוב

Ni M			
טבאות	יאות	חקין, יאות	יאות, טבאות
כדו	כדון	כען	כדון, כדו
ארום אלא הן	ארום אלהן	אלהין	אלא
לווי	אלווי	לוי	הלואי
חלש	שלח	שלח	שלח, חלש
חסל	שלם	שלם	חסל
טייל	הלך	הלך	הלך, טייל
טליתא	רביתה	עולימה	טליתא
קלק	טלך	רמא	טלק, קלק

In the majority of cases the variations between E and/or Ni M and other PT manuscripts correspond to variations found within the PTM dialect as well. This fact, combined with the absence, except by occasional corruption, of many other Onkelos forms (e.g. אזדן and related verb and suffix forms), suggests that the language changes within the PT tradition were revisions made periodically to bring the Targum language into agreement with changing Galilean usage. The extent to which the Babylonian dialect influenced the later stages of development of the Galilean dialect is a separate question. If this theory is correct, the language of CG Ms D may be just as "Galilean" as that of Ms E, and the major regular differences between the two may represent changes in a living language. If this hypothesis is correct, the more revised versions of the Palestinian Targum may be just as valuable linguistically as the earlier ones, as aids to the understanding of the development of Galilean Aramaic. On the other hand, the versions which seem to preserve the earliest form of the dialect would be more likely to contain original readings, as any disagreements with the Masoretic Text would tend to be edited out.

The language revisions seem to have occurred somewhat independently of the textual variations and developments which produce significant contrasts between the various PT versions. The separation of language change from text change is seen most clearly in Ms P, whose individual readings resemble Ni M, although many details of its language are closer to Ni or to Ms D.

There seem to be at least three layers of language change in the CG texts. The oldest dialect is represented by Mss A and E. A number

of changes are found in Mss B, C, and D. The shift from הינון to אינון is a good example. A later layer of change may be represented by the shift from עוד to תוב, found only in D and F, and among the later Mss in P and Ni (usually). Ms P in addition is the only Ms using קומי. This could be a sign of a revision date later than that of any of the CG Mss, but this form could also be a development parallel with קדם, if both are understood as stemming from קודם. Also, the difference between קודם and קדם seems to have been simply orthographic (Ni M, which in general preserves E lexicographical and morphological variants but not the details of its orthography, ignores this variation). In this case the only real variant would be P's form.

A corollary to the theory of language revision within the PT tradition is that any disagreement of the later Mss against <u>all</u> the CG Mss is probably to be regarded as late. Examples in Ni are the elimination of ממריה and דאית and its replacement (primarily in the first part of Genesis) of להוד with אף.

Finally, as to the question of "literary" versus "folk" language, in the writer's judgment both Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum are to be regarded as "literary" in the sense that both are rather literal translations. Onkelos is perhaps more literal, following every detail of the Hebrew syntax even where this distorts the Aramaic. The Palestinian version seems "freer" in a somewhat greater variation in syntax and verb forms, and in its use of particles not paralleling anything in the Hebrew (e. g. כען) and two words to take the place of one (קליל זעיר, שפר וחקן, חן וחסד).

Furthermore the various language shifts described above seem to reflect an accommodation to a living language. On the other hand, in its apparent basis in a Greek text, PT has a different set of "literary" characteristics not found in Onkelos. It should also be pointed out that PT shares with O the typical care of a deliberate and unified translation in rendering into Aramaic the distinctions of language found in Hebrew.

In the writer's opinion the major differences in form and vocabulary between Onkelos and PT do not reflect "literary" and "popular" usage respectively but correspond to a considerable distance between the two in both place and time. Furthermore, in view of the closeness of the language of O to that of the Genesis Apocryphon, there seems no reason for supposing the language to be a literary one and a wholly artificial one deliberately created in the fifth century A. D.[1]

The language of PJ, on the other hand, cannot be said to be even a literary form of a single dialect. It combines elements of the dialects of both Targums and the later rabbinic literature as well to create an artificial and somewhat inconsistent "dialect" of its own. Although there is some evidence that the basis, or one of the bases, of PJ is a version of Onkelos, the editor obviously has intentionally replaced many Onkelos words with Palestinian words. It would require further analysis to determine whether his principle of selection favored Palestinian words as such, or simply different or unusual words.

---

1. Kahle, Masoreten des Westens, II, 11*.

ii. Date

Judging from the forms included in the comparative table made for this chapter, Targum Onkelos has a very obvious affinity with the language of the Genesis Apocryphon, which is probably first-century A. D.; the Palestinian Targum, on the other hand, has a great deal in common with the fourth and fifth-century language of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, with Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and, to a lesser extent, with Samaritan Aramaic.

It is well known that Biblical Aramaic is very close to Imperial Aramaic, a standardized and "official" language. It can be assumed that the categorization of Onkelos as "literary" is based upon its resemblance to Biblical Aramaic as well as its literal translation style. On the same grounds Kahle classified the Genesis Apocryphon as a work in "literary" Aramaic.[1] However, as our sources for first- and second-century Aramaic have come to include an increasing variety of material, including letters (Murabaʿât) and even targumic material (Qumrân), the type of language development postulated by Kutscher seems better supported. Each new discovery differs in some details from others but all resemble one another more than they resemble Galilean Aramaic or the Palestinian Targum.

Without including any language data other than that shown on the table, a continuum of language change can be seen which links the language of O and PT at a number of points. This overlapping, again, suggests that Onkelos has a natural place in a continuous developmental process.

---

1. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., p. 200.

Forms shared by O and PT fall into various categories. דידי/דילי and ארום/ארי are two pairs which differ in form but are parallel in use and unknown in BA. Both are used in a limited manner in QA, more broadly in the Targums. The first continues in general use in PTM; the second is not found, although ארי is used in the Babylonian Talmud. The wholesale use of ארום/ארי to translate כי is a specific targumic translation convention shared by O and PT. As discussed in the previous section, this common use should not be attributed to a single literary source for both, but to common traditions of translation. Cowling refers to ארום as the "later" form;[1] however, since this usage apparently developed from the interjection ארו,[2] the two forms might better be seen as parallel developments, one Galilean and the other Judean. Another specific PT distinguishing feature might be the use of די to translate אשר and ד for other purposes in the Palestinian Targum, which differs from BA wholesale use of די as well as from the use in O and PTM of ד in all meanings.

לחדא is found in QA, all Targums and CPA, but not in PTM, which uses סגי.

הדין and parallel forms are found in both Targums and the Galilean dialects, but are unknown in BA and QA. The infrequently used הידין ("which?") form is found in Targum Jonathan (not Onkelos) and subsequent dialects except SA. כות appears first in O. לות, limited to the expression מן לות in BA and QA, is used frequently

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 212.

2. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., p. 221, n. 4.

for to-motion in the Targums. In PTM it is no longer much used. OJ's כמה ד and most of the varying forms used by PT and others involve the particle מה, not found in the BA expression הא כדי. O, PT, and PTM use כען and בבעו as equivalents for Hebrew נא; QA has נה.

Thus, O and PT share a number of forms and in a small number of cases share a specific translation use not found elsewhere. This evidence suggests a dating for Onkelos later than the Genesis Apocryphon and a date for the first edition of the Palestinian Targum somewhat earlier than the Palestinian Talmud. For PT, Cowling's suggestion of a date in the latter part of the third century seems appropriate.[1] Subsequent editions and revisions then would embody elements characteristic of various periods in the writing of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, fourth through sixth centuries. However, since these revisions never removed all the distinctive features of PT, even late versions retain features characteristic of a period earlier than PTM. Besides the uses of ארום and די/ד mentioned above, another notable distinctive feature is the differential verb ending system for third person plural perfect. In PT only verbs with third radical weak are nunated, whereas in PTM nunation is found for all verb classes. The later versions never adopt a wholesale nunation; the medieval versions show some tendency to drop the nuns in imitation of Onkelos.

For Onkelos a second-century date seems likely. The traditional date of A. D. 140 is entirely possible.[2] A later date in the second

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 214.
2. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, p. 205.

century would also be entirely acceptable. In view of the obvious resemblance of Onkelos to the Genesis Apocryphon, it seems more reasonable to give it an early date than to date it to the fifth century A. D. and then seek to explain its difference from the language of the Babylonian Talmud by describing the language as literary, artificial, or archaized. A second-century date also would square well with the traditions concerning the schools of Sura and Nehardea.[1]

Another important source of evidence for the development of Palestinian Aramaic is the collection of letters written by Bar Kochba.[2] In addition to regular employment of יח before nouns and in the formation of object pronouns, a characteristic these letters share with all the Targums, other agreements are found, with the Palestinian Targums in some cases, with Onkelos in others.

Agreements with the Palestinian Targums are the frequent use of he rather than aleph as a final vowel letter and the use of the full form די instead of ד which is invariable in Onkelos.

Agreements with Onkelos are the pronoun אנחנא, the use of אם instead of אין (a Hebraized usage highly characteristic of Onkelos, and, unlike most of his language, disagreeing with Biblical Aramaic), and the form חדו, which in Palestinian Aramaic would be nunated.

The letters preserve two early usages, די and אנחנא, one

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 42.

2. These letters have been published in the Israel Exploration Journal (supra, p. 20, n. 5) and in Leshonenu (supra, p. 31, n. 3.

of which is preserved in the Palestinian Targums but disappears in the Palestinian rabbinic writings, the other of which is preserved in Onkelos but disappears in the Babylonian Talmud. Both forms are found in Qumrân Aramaic. These facts suggest a date for the Bar Kochba letters slightly earlier than either Targumic translation in its present form. The writer would judge the language elements in the letters resembling Onkelos to be slightly more important than those resembling the Palestinian Targum. Thus the evidence from these letters dated around A. D. 135 agrees well with the proposed dates for the two Targums given above.

Gustaf Dalman dates Pseudo-Jonathan, together with the Palestinian Targum, to the fourth or fifth century A. D.[1] It has already been suggested that PT should not be classified with PJ. Because of the inclusion in PJ of what seem, on the evidence of the revision patterns of the Palestinian Targum, to be later Galilean forms, such as תורב and קומי , the writer prefers a date no earlier that the fifth century A. D. Actually a considerably later date would probably be more accurate. The kind of language selection made by PJ suggests a period when Targum Onkelos was in general use, Talmud and Midrash were fully published and disseminated, and the Palestinian Targum was known only in selective uses (Exodus 20) and as an object of scholarly study (the selection by PJ of rare PT words). Geoffrey Cowling dates PJ to the eighth or ninth century A. D.

---

1. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., p. 34.

because this was a period when ancient texts came to light, and PJ does include material of an apparently pre-Christian date.[1] Such a late date is perfectly possible, and still early enough to allow for the mutual influences seen between Pseudo-Jonathan and the medieval manuscripts of the Palestinian Targum.

iii. Place

If the Palestinian Targum is dated to the third century, it must be located in Galilee. The assumption of its use throughout all of Palestine would be relevant only if it were dated earlier than A. D. 135, since the rabbinic schools in Judea were destroyed at that time and operations transferred to Galilee.[2]

E. Y. Kutscher has argued for a Palestinian origin for Targum Onkelos.[3] This seems possible; because it was apparently unknown in Galilee, it would be regarded as Judean. This is Gustaf Dalman's understanding.[4] The various agreements and overlappings between O and PT also suggest some sort of common element in the formation of their respective dialects. It seems quite possible that Onkelos may have been written in Judea shortly before A. D. 135 and almost immediately transported to Babylon, without ever becoming known in Galilee (if the translation were this early, its relation to the Bar Kochba dialect would suggest that the orthography and morphology were revised somewhat in Babylon). It is equally possible that it

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, p. 68.
2. Cecil Roth et al., "Jews," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1965, XII, 1054-81.
3. Kutscher, "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon," p. 10.
4. Dalman, Grammatik, 2nd ed., p. 13.

was first produced in Babylon. Since a dialect is characteristic of a people, not a location, the initial dialect of any migrants from Judea to Babylon would be Judean, and a translation made while the first generation were still alive would still have been basically Judean. The tabulation made in this chapter was not designed to reveal specifically Babylonian elements in Onkelos; however, discussions of the language of Onkelos usually stress its divergence from the Babylonian dialect more than its similarity. The dialect is, of course, "Eastern" in the sense that its origin was in Imperial Aramaic, but this scarcely proves that it must have been written in Babylonia.

Because of the mixed nature of the language of Pseudo-Jonathan it cannot be placed as a dialect of a particular location. It is highly unlikely that a dialect offering such a combination of words ever existed. After Aramaic ceased to be the common language scholars familiar with texts of various kinds may have combined originally incompatible forms in such a way. In any case, the location of the author or editor would involve an inquiry outside the scope of this study.

iv. Summary

Targum Onkelos is a literary second-century A. D. translation of the Masoretic text, made either in Judea or Babylonia, but in an essentially Judean dialect. The official version produced in the fifth century A. D. probably made no major modification in the original. Paraphrastic or poetic material in the text may be older than the main body of translation.

The Palestinian Targum is a literary but slightly freer translation from a Greek version. The location is Galilee, the date third century A. D. Paraphrastic material in this text also may be older than the translation. No official text was ever produced but versions developed differing considerably in text and including increasing quantities of additional material. Systematic language revisions maintaining the translation in conformity to the changing Galilean dialect continued perhaps through the fifth or sixth century A. D. The text of Codex Neofiti 1 is a late revised version; the principal marginalia preserve a very early and valuable version.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is a very full Targum combining Targum Onkelos with extensive additional material, including many individual words typical of the Palestinian Targum which replace Onkelos words, as well as longer passages from PT, the Talmud, the Midrashim, and further material unknown elsewhere, some of which seems to have a pre-Christian origin. Its language is inconsistent and artificial, useful as a witness to individual words or phrases but not as a witness to a genuine dialect. Its date may be as late as the eighth or ninth century A. D. It is not a member of the Palestinian Targum family although it utilizes PT material.

The above conclusions are in essential agreement with those of Gustaf Dalman, except that his assessment of the Palestinian Targum, in which he took Pseudo-Jonathan as the chief witness and the Fragment Targums and Tosefta passages in Onkelos as further examples of the same text, must be re-evaluated. Nevertheless his understanding of the "Jerusalem Targum" as closely related to the Galilean dialect

was correct. The text of the Palestinian Targum, viewed separately from that of Pseudo-Jonathan, is more Galilean and earlier than he supposed. A revision of Dalman's grammar, separating PJ from PT and including the new evidence from the Cairo Geniza texts and Neofiti 1, is needed.

In dating Onkelos earlier than the Palestinian Targum and granting its language a relationship to the spoken language of Judea (while acknowledging its rather rigid form) the writer follows the view of Dalman and more recently of Kutscher, against the view identified with Kahle. It is known that the dialect of Galilee differed from that of Judea in New Testament times; we do have words in the New Testament which correspond to words in the vocabulary of the Palestinian Targum. However, Kutscher's view of an increasing divergence of dialects seems reasonable, and the evidence presented in this chapter shows that not only the Galilean dialect but the "literary" language of Onkelos can be placed on a continuum of constant linguistic change. The greatest discontinuity, demonstrated in the tables above, is in specific vocabulary items. In a very large percentage of cases Biblical Aramaic, Qumrân Aramaic, and the language of Onkelos use one word, whereas the Palestinian Targum, the language of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic use another. Samaritan Aramaic seems to occupy an intermediate position, just as Samaria is located geographically between Galilee and Judea. Further study is needed to determine the origin of the divergent vocabulary selection which was incorporated in the fully developed Galilean Aramaic which succeeded Judean Aramaic as a literary language in Palestine.

CHAPTER IV

TEXT RECENSIONS IN CODEX NEOFITI 1

1. Introduction

In her study of the marginalia to Deuteronomy, Shirley Lund discovered "a change in the text and M which warrants a separate study" beyond Deuteronomy 29:17.[1] Geoffrey Cowling has commented further that "we may also deduce from the consistency of the marginal variants throughout the Pentateuch, that a manuscript similar to E was extant for all the books, and was used throughout. A doubt remains for Deuteronomy 29:17 to the end, and for the first few chapters of Genesis."[2] An examination of the beginning chapters of Genesis shows that here, too, as in Deuteronomy, the change in the character of the marginalia is related to changes in the text.

The survey method described in Chapter III served not only to determine the dominant usages in Neofiti 1, but also to reveal the existence of clusters of variant forms at the beginning and end of the manuscript. A closer examination of the sections in question confirmed the judgment of Lund and Cowling. The main body of the text of Neofiti 1, although subject to various revisions and errors, seems to represent a single basic recension; in Genesis 1-4 and Deuteronomy 29:18-34:12, however, other recensions have been used to

---

1. Lund, Thesis, p. 24.

2. Cowling, Thesis, p. 218. More correctly, this should be "Deuteronomy 29:18 to the end," since 29:17 is the last verse showing typical marginalia.

complete the text. It can be assumed that at some time (probably at several different times) in the history of the transmission of the recension represented by Codex Neofiti 1, the beginning and end sections, which would have been most subject to wear, were lost or became illegible, so that restoration had to be made from other recensions. Thus each separate section must be considered as a different recension, or at least as representing a different manuscript (the first and second section in Genesis, for example, are so close to one another that they might be best described as two copies of the same recension).

A secondary result of the examination of Genesis 1-4 was the solution of the question of the meaning of the fluctuations in the signs placed in the margin to identify variant readings. This fluctuation, and the almost complete disappearance of the signs after the first few chapters of Genesis, can now clearly be seen to be connected with the use of multiple recensions, each already supplied with marginalia, to complete the text of the Pentateuch.

2. The Text Recensions

i. Genesis 1-4

A different text was suspected for the opening section of Genesis for two reasons: (a) These first chapters, and particularly Chapter 1, have very few marginalia; (b) surveys of various vocabulary elements showed different forms in these chapters from those in the succeeding text. A closer examination showed that there may be as many as five varying text sections in the first four chapters of

Genesis. The identification of the first three seems certain; the remaining two are only probable.

The first three units were identified by the marginal notations accompanying the variants: First א"ס ("another book"), then א"נ ("another version"), then א"ס again. It was not possible to determine any variation in the type of variants presented which would account for this periodic change of terminology, or for the termination of these markings at 3:4.[1] It was then discovered that the shift from א"ס to א"נ between 1:23 and 1:24 corresponded to a shift in the spelling of "word," from ממרא to ממריה. The conclusion was reached that each shift represented a different manuscript with marginalia, and that the marginal notation systems employed had simply been copied without any effort to regularize the usage. Although the exact limits of the textual types subsequent to the first could not be verified as precisely by changes in the text, variations were found in each one to support this hypothesis.

It need not be supposed, of course, that our current copy of the Palestinian Targum, Neofiti 1, has been completed from five different manuscripts. Such a collection of variant texts would develop gradually, as a worn or missing opening section was replaced by copying from another version, a later version then mended from the former which now represented two manuscripts, and so forth.

---

1. א"ס appears later to mark long additional sections belonging to the secondary or tertiary marginalia. א"ל ("another language") appears twice in the margin at Genesis 8:13, marking two readings which agree with Pseudo-Jonathan.

(1) Genesis 1:1-1:23

This section shows striking agreement with Paris 110; it seems closer to P than to the Vatican 440 group (which is fragmentary here, whereas P gives the whole chapter). Characteristic usages differing from P are ממרא for "word" (P has ממריה) and שפר ותקין (P has טב ותקין). The word for "man" is בר נש. Marginalia for this section are almost nonexistent. The most common one is ממרה, pointed with sere to show that a proleptic pronominal suffix is intended, not simply a correction of vowel letter aleph to he. Even this variant is not given consistently, so that it seems doubtful that we really have a complete collation with another manuscript here. Aside from its agreement with Paris, the use of כן instead of כדין indicates that this text is probably of the E type usually found in the margin in Neofiti.

(2) Genesis 1:24-2:5a

At Genesis 1:24 we pass from page 2a to 2b of the manuscript, and find a new marginal notation and a new spelling for "word": ממריה. This is the form that appears regularly in the margin in the main portion of the text of Neofiti. The usage for "man" and "beautiful and good" remains the same. This section sometimes omits ממריה, which is supplied by the margin, or uses איקריה, which the margin opposes with ממריה. Marginalia agree with P but do not account for all the variations of P from this text. The text of P itself is not completely consistent. At 1:27 it has ממרא, and at 1:31 it has שפר ותקין rather than its usual reading.

Beginning with 2:1, the marginalia seem to correspond better to the text of P, accounting for most of its variation from the text

found in Neofiti. The Vatican 440 texts do not exist here. It is noteworthy that Paris 110 also has marginalia corresponding to the readings of Neofiti at Genesis 1:1 and 2:2, marked with נ"א.

At Genesis 1:29 and 1:30 are found two uses of דאית, the form so characteristic of the Palestinian Targum which has been edited out of Neofiti 1 in most instances. This section, then, seems to be very similar to the first, and also a representative of the E-V 440-P language type rather than of that more characteristic of Ni. However, the marginalia do include one variant typical of Cairo Geniza manuscript E but no longer found in the Vatican 440 group or in Paris 110: דמש, "to creep," where all the later versions (including the text of this section), have דחש. This form is found in the margin at 1:24, 25, 26, 28, and 30. Therefore the text here cannot be identified as closely with E as can the text underlying the marginalia. It seems entirely possible that the text used for marginalia here could be the same, or similar, to that used for the main body of Ni; there would be fewer marginal notations because the text itself was more nearly of the same type. In view of the varying marginal signs, however, it does not seem possible that this annotation could have been added in continuity with that of the body of the text.

(3) Genesis 2:5b-3:4

The text division has been made in the middle of a verse because this is where the marginal signs change again. This change is within two lines of the bottom of a page (3a) and probably originally marked a change of page.

This section, unlike the two previous, shows definite signs of accommodation to the Masoretic text. "Man" is rendered by אדם, "good" by טב, and "ground" by אדמתא. This last reading is not found anywhere else in the Neofiti text of Genesis, and seems to be a clear attempt to reproduce the Hebrew distinction which PT has ignored, using ארעא for both הארץ and האדמה. This distinctive reading is found at 2:7, 9, and 19. It would be expected at 2:6 also; perhaps a scribe has changed this unexpected word at its first occurrence.

Genesis 2:18 seems to be an intrusion in this section; it has תקן, בר נשא, and אעבד, where אדם, טב, and אברא would be expected from the usage of the remainder of the section. The marginal reading gives אדם but gives no variant for the other two words.

Throughout this section יי אלהים is given, paralleling the Hebrew text, while the margin reads ממריה דיי, the more characteristic PT phraseology. A tendency in the text to correct the word structure to that of the Hebrew is also seen; the text reads אפי ארעא, a construct relation like that of the Hebrew, against the marginal אפה דארעא. Several other examples of the same type are found. The marginalia in general correspond to V 440 or P; these sources are fragmentary here so it is difficult to judge which one is closer; one marginal reading is nearer to P, another to V 440. Marginal readings are rather limited in extent except at 2:15-18. At 3:3 the text reads די and the margin דאית.

This revised text section cannot be identified with the main text of Neofiti 1, also frequently revised to MT, because of the distinctive use of אדמתא .

(4) Genesis 3:5-24

The distinctive marginal signs end at 3:4 (near the bottom of page 4b); the division of the remaining material into two sections, and its distinction from the text beginning at chapter 5, are not certain, but there do seem to be certain indications separating these sections from the body of the text and from one another.

The marginalia for this chapter seem particularly close to those of Paris 110, so far as they represent major variations of the text. As far as typical morphology and orthography, they are in accord with the usage continuing throughout the Neofiti manuscript. There seems no reason, then, why the marginalia here could not be continuous with those following even if the text shows variation. The marginalia of Ni, in language and specific readings, show an excellent agreement with CG Ms E; since Ms E first is extant for chapter 6, no comparison can be made here. CG Ms B, which is present for portions of chapters 2, 3, and 4, does not agree with the marginalia as well as P and V 440.

Distinctive readings of this fourth section are listed below.

3:6: לחוד: This is a normal PT reading but has been replaced by אף in the section immediately following and in the main section of the Neofiti text through the first half of Genesis.

3:7, 15: אינון : This is the usual Ni form. הנון , typical of E and Ni M, is found in the margin at 7, but not at expanded 15.

3:8: ממרה דיי : This is usually reduced to יי in Ni.

3:11: מאן : This distinctive use of medial aleph as a vowel letter is not usual for Ni. This spelling is found elsewhere only at Genesis 48:8.

3:12: עמי : The marginal reading, גבי, is of the E type.

3:15: כד : This is the form of Ni and the later versions. E and Ni M usually have כירון ד, not found in the margin here, however.

3:19: קאם : Here again is an unusual use of medial aleph.

This text is quite near to the Ni text type but varies in its orthography with aleph, and is separated from the main text by the following section with a different set of divergences from the text.

(5) Genesis 4

This section contains considerable expansion, which complicates evaluation of the language. However, among a number of usages agreeing with those usual for Ni, several are found which seem to indicate a different text here also.

4:1: בר : This is the usual Ni form; the margin reads בעיר, a typical E form. The same text-margin variation is found at 4:26.

4:4, 22, 26: אף : The margin reads לחוד in the first two cases. This usage agrees with the following text and disagrees with that of the section immediately preceding.

4:4, 5: קרבניה : This is a sign of revision, replacing the typical PT use of a Greek word with a separate possessive, דורון דידיה (δῶρον), which is found in the margin.

4:8: כירון ד: This reading, usually typical of the margin, occurs in the expanded portion of the text, and the margin has כד

agreeing with P and PJ. The marginale here may be secondary, as this is not a normal marginal form.

4:8, 25: חורן : אוחרן is found in the margin in the second instance. The form in the text shows influence from the language of PJ. It is also found elsewhere in Ni occasionally.

4:9: הן : This form is definitely not typical of Ni, appearing in the margin instead in all other instances, against אן in the text.

4:13: אינון : הנון appears in the margin.

4:15: מן : This reading is significant because it is different from the spelling with aleph of the preceding section.

4:16: קודמוי : This plene orthography is characteristic of E, not Ni.

4:25: עוד : Ni usually has תוב ; this usage is particularly regular in the section immediately following.

Because of its use of הן , עוד , and קודמוי , Genesis 4 is judged to be from a manuscript differing somewhat from that found in the following chapters.

ii. Deuteronomy 29:18-34:12

As stated above, the text change at the end of Deuteronomy was discovered by Shirley Lund. The end of the marginalia agreeing with the Vatican 440 group is very noticeable and has been traced for several specific variants.[1] In one case, a regular marginal variant, זרעיית בניהון where the text has simply בניהון , appears three times in the text subsequent to 29:18.

---

1. The writer appreciates the use of unpublished studies by Dr. Lund on this point.

Chapter 34 was found by Dr. Lund to be virtually identical to the Vatican 440 manuscript.[1] The remaining section, 29:18-33:29, cannot be identified specifically with the V 440 group, however, since several typical marginal variants agreeing with this group, found before 29:18, do not appear in the text subsequent to it. The same reading continues as before, but without a marginal correction. The writer made a rough comparison of this section with the V 440 group, P, and PJ. No Cairo Geniza manuscripts are extant for this section (for 34:5-12 we have F, which is close to Ni here, but V 440 is closer). The prose sections sometimes agree with P, but the poetic expansions are not identical to any other text included in this study. They are definitely closer to the Palestinian Targum than to Pseudo-Jonathan, however.

The infrequent marginalia are not readily identifiable with the texts included in this study, either. They are so few in number that, if they represent a complete collation with another text, it must be a text very similar to the one given. A more complete study of the language of this section, similar to that done for the opening chapters of Genesis, is needed. The writer hopes to complete such a study in the near future.

3. Conclusions

In the beginning and final sections of the Neofiti 1 manuscript seven distinct text units different from the main body of the text have been found. It is important that the student of this manuscript

---

1. Private communication.

should realize these variant sections exist; since they represent different texts, each must be considered as if it were a separate manuscript. The variety presented by these manuscripts implies that the Palestinian Targum flourished longer, and in more versions, than could have been realized when our only medieval copies of the Palestinian Targum were the two Fragment Targum groups.

It is interesting that the two opening sections closely resemble Paris 110 (complete for Genesis 1, whereas the V 440 group is not), while the final section is almost identical with Vatican 440 (complete for Deuteronomy 34, whereas P is not). It is possible (though certainly not necessary) that the texts used for these sections were from versions of the two Fragment Targum types, already in use as supplements to Onkelos, and therefore more readily available, perhaps, than complete manuscripts.

CHAPTER V

TOWARD A CRITICAL TEXT OF THE PALESTINIAN TARGUM

1. Introduction

In Chapter III it was concluded that all versions of the Palestinian Targum extant have their origin in a single translation. If this hypothesis is correct, it should now be possible, by using the two virtually complete versions (Ni text and margin) we now possess in conjunction with the fragmentary versions, to make substantial progress toward a critical text.

It is desirable, however, first to have a more complete survey and summary of the language elements of the Palestinian Targum. According to McNamara, "grammars on Neofiti are being prepared by students of A. Diez Macho."[1] This work on Neofiti can be added to the work of Doubles on the Fragment Targum and that of Cowling based on the Cairo Geniza. It is to be hoped also that the concept of dialect development set forth in Chapter III above may be utilized and expanded. No date is projected for the appearance of the grammar of Neofiti. However, since most of the words in Neofiti can be easily classified by collation with a Hebrew concordance, it is to be hoped this work will appear soon.

---

1. Martin McNamara, The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, p. 31, n. 152. This note also mentions a forthcoming grammar of the Aramaic from the Bereshith Rabba Ms Vat. Ebr. 30. This Ms is said to offer a particularly pure Palestinian Aramaic. It will be extremely interesting to see what selection of forms it offers in comparison with those of the various PT manuscripts.

In order for such a grammar to be properly evaluated and criticized, the relevant texts must first be made available, as Matthew Black points out.[1] If the Madrid polyglot text is published as planned, it will include all Palestinian Targum material.[2] However, in the meantime, Cowling's suggestions for publication of various documents in facsimile form are most helpful.[3] The proposed facsimile edition of Neofiti 1 by the Vatican would make that text fully available. It is to be hoped that it is to be equipped with chapter and verse numbers. Cowling's suggestion for publication of a facsimile of the beautiful Vatican 440 text is also most attractive. However, the writer would like to see such an edition equipped not only with chapter and verse numbers but with the critical apparatus prepared by Doubles. While it is true that V is the "best" text of its group, it does contain errors and shortened forms which can be understood more readily by comparison with the variants of the other Mss.[4] It seems probable that Ginsburger's editions of Paris 110 and Pseudo-Jonathan could be revised and re-issued without a complete resetting of type.[5] The proposed re-edition of the Cairo Geniza material by Schelbert[6] would complete the series needed for study of

---

1. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed., p. 45.
2. W. Baars points out some omissions in the specimen edition. Review, Vetus Testamentum, XVII (1967), 127-28.
3. Cowling, Thesis, pp. 90-92.
4. Rabbinic Bible editions contain Bomberg and PJ, but are cumbersome.
5. Doubles has proposed to do a re-edition of P. Thesis, p. 78*.
6. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, 2nd ed., p. 205.

the PT translations. Some additional isolated expansions, found as Tosefta in Onkelos Mss, etc., would have to be gathered together to make the collection complete. There is a question whether some of these passages belong with PT as far as language; however for the benefit of the many scholars who are more interested in content, they certainly should be readily available.

Because of the considerations above, a critical edition of the PT at this time would be premature. However, tentative suggestions for an approach to this edition can be made. Such suggestions are given below and their application then demonstrated with a sample chapter, Genesis 43.

2. The Procedure of Criticism

i. Procedure for Deciding Internal Evidence

(1) The shorter reading is often preferable. A reading shorter than the Masoretic Text, however, should be regarded as a possible error, especially if MT shows no confusion or Ms divergence, and no other witnesses to the short reading are given.

(2) The harder reading is often preferable.

(3) The reading from which the other readings in a variant could most easily have developed is preferable.

(4) The reading which is most characteristic of the translation is generally preferable. If a particular Aramaic word is regularly found to correspond to a particular Hebrew word (or Greek word, if the Greek translations offer distinctions not found in the Hebrew) this is usually the preferable word. Allowance must be made, however, for variations in usage or for a special meaning of the word at that point.

(5) Greek and Latin words are to be preferred to Aramaic words. These words should be regarded as original. The use of foreign words has always been regarded as an outstanding characteristic of PT; the view of PT as a translation from Greek further reinforces this idea.[1]

ii. Procedure for Deciding External Evidence

(1) Readings agreeing with Greek versions are to be preferred. This applies to clear correspondences. "Correspondences" which require a considerable amount of conjecture may be better explained as errors. This principle is, of course, also based on the assumption of a Greek original.

(2) Cairo Geniza Ms E is the model for orthography and morphology. The E Ms is an excellent example of "Palestinian" usage. This is particularly noticeable in its regular use of final he. The Mi margin, which agrees well with Ms E, does not preserve purely orthographic variants to any extent. The plene forms characteristic of E are also suitable to a production of an unpointed critical text, which is what is undertaken here. Ms A is also thoroughly "Palestinian" and preserves the Palestinian pointing as well. It would be of the greatest importance in arriving at a pointed text. The E Ms has been specified here, however, for these reasons: (a) It is much more extensive than A; (b) it is related clearly to other Mss, while A is not. The adoption of E forms, of course, involves a great deal of minor alteration of the text without any direct witness, in passages where E is not present. This is considered justifiable in view of the

---

1. Principles (1)-(4) are taken with only minor alteration from J. Harold Greenlee, Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964).

very simple and easily understandable nature of the variations involved.

(3) The text of Mi M and related Mss is to be preferred. Mi M and CG E are to be regarded as approximately equally good witnesses to the original text. Mi M seems slightly better in preserving original readings, and is, of course, our only complete text except for the much more revised and corrupted Mi text itself. The marginal text must, of course, be reproduced by inserting the marginal variants into the continuous Neofiti text.

Secondary witnesses to E and Mi M are CG Ms F (somewhat revised), the Vatican 440 group (somewhat revised and corrupted) with preference for VL over N, and P (considerably revised and corrupted, nevertheless with agreements with E and Mi M against V 440).

It must be emphasized that no one of these texts is to be identified with the original translation. The Fragment Targum texts, both V 440 and P, preserve original readings no longer found in E, as does the much-revised Mi text. Cowling identifies B, C, and F as revisions of E[1]; the writer is not aware of any readings in these texts which would bring this identification into question (since the four Mss involved translate different parts of the Pentateuch, no direct comparison is possible).

The remaining Mss from the Cairo Geniza not included in the grouping of witnesses above (A, B, C, D) should of course be carefully examined wherever they are present. The amount of material available for study of PT is still so limited that there is really little need

---

1. Cowling, Thesis, Summary.

for identification of "families." Every witness available can and should be studied separately.

The choice of the E group as the basis for a critical text, however, does dictate regular use of certain forms and exclusion of others. The writer believes that the varying usages of PT reflect revision with the passage of time, and that the E combination of uses is likely to be the earliest of those we possess (CG Ms A's usage of these frequent words corresponds to E's). The choice of the E/ Mi M language involves the use of some typically "Palestinian" words and the exclusion of others. For example: Three words usually regarded as "Palestinian" are הינון, כדין, and תוב, against Onkelos' use of אינון, כן, and עוד. Ms E, however, uses regularly only the first of the three "Palestinian" forms; Mi M is even more consistent in this pattern. The three forms are found together only in CG Ms F, the latest of the CG Mss, and in PJ. It therefore seems likely that, although all "Palestinian," they belong to somewhat different periods of time.

In using the principal marginalia of Neofiti 1, it is necessary to distinguish them from secondary and tertiary marginalia. Some of the additional marginal readings may be readily identified as resembling PJ, Tosefta Onkelos, or other sources unrelated to the E family. Readings of one or a few words must be judged in accordance with their conformity to general usage of the text type.

(4) Readings different from those of Onkelos or MT are to be preferred. Aside from the revisions dictated by dialect changes, most alterations in the text proceeded in these directions. This

tendency of revision toward two extremely well-known texts is very helpful to the textual critic. In a great many cases the reason for the revision is instantly recognizable and the decision as to the original form readily made.

(5) Any text may preserve an original reading.

iii. Textual Criticism of the Additions

This study has been primarily limited to the translation text of PT. There seems some indication that the additions contain language different from that of the surrounding text--in some cases earlier, in others later. A thorough understanding of the translation language should be helpful in evaluating the language of additions. The additions seem to have had a more complex history than the text. Further study would be necessary to determine whether an original text could be found underlying a varying set of additions, especially since some of these present considerable variations in meaning. A tentative principle would be to follow the E/Mi M version. Where widely varying versions exist, it would probably be necessary to print several parallel versions in full. A reduction of extensive variations to critical apparatus form becomes too complex to be useful.

iv. Critical Apparatus

The critical text sample presented below has been left without apparatus, for simplicity. It is suggested, however, that the critical apparatus be limited to variants giving a different meaning or at least an unusual word, and that regularly occurring dialectal variations as well as revisions toward Onkelos and MT be excluded.

3. A Specimen Critical Text: Genesis 43

This chapter has been chosen because of the wide range of resources available in different sections. This chapter includes part of one of the relatively few sections of Neofiti 1 for which the marginalia were not done. Thus, at the beginning of the chapter, Ni and E are our only sources of PT. At a later point in the chapter, on the other hand, we have not only marginalia but CG Mss D and E, and all members of the Vatican 440 group. No CG or FT witnesses exist for 4 verses before the beginning of the marginalia; the Ni text is our sole source of PT, and any critical revisions in the text must be made from analogy with E/Ni M usage elsewhere. The occurrence of the witnesses is summarized below (* indicates partial text).

	Ni	Ni M	CG E	CG D	V 440	P
Gen.	1		1			
	2		2			
	3		3			
	4		4			
	5		5			
	6		6			
	7		7	7*		
	8		8	8*		
	9		9		9*	9*
	10		10*	10		
	11			11*		
	12			12*	12*	
	13					
	14			14*	14*	14*
	15					
	16			16*		
	17					
	18			18*		
	19					19*
	20			20*		
	21			21*		
	22					
	23		23*	23*		
	24		24			
	25		25	25		
	26	26	26	26*		

	Ni	Ni M	CG E	CG D	V 440	P
Gen.	27	27	27			
	28	28	28*	28		
	29	29	29			
	30	30	30	30*	30*	
	31	31	31	31	31*	
	32	32	32			
	33	33	33	33		
	34	34	34			

The D text is "partial" because of its poor condition; it preserves a much larger quantity of material than the V 440 and P texts which in some verses preserve only a single word. The E text is complete except at the page beginning (v. 23) and in verse 28, where an error of homoioteleuton has been made.

In the following critical text, all readings which involve any variation will be underlined. Reasons for the revisions will be discussed following each verse. Repeatedly occurring types of revision will be underlined wherever they appear, but described only at the first occurrence, if the principle of revision in subsequent instances is clear.

Genesis 43 is found on Folios 89a-91b of Codex Neofiti 1. The marginalia commence at 91a, the beginning of a quire. The locations of the other materials used are:

CG Ms E: Gen. 43:1-10: A Diez Macho, "Nuevos Fragmentos del Targum Palestinense," Sefarad, XV (1955), 38-39.
Gen. 43:23-34: Masoreten des Westens, II, 47-48.

CG Ms D: Gen. 43:7-33: Masoreten des Westens, II, 19-20.

V 440 Group: Gen. 43:9, 12, 14, 30, 31: Doubles Thesis, p. 33.

Paris 110: Gen. 43:9, 14, 19: Ginsburger, Das Fragmententhargum, p. 22.

Genesis 43:1

והרעב/ וכיפנה תקף בארעה.

Now the famine was severe in the land.

All targums agree in this brief verse. Ni, O, and PJ are identical. E, which has been followed, disagrees in orthography and morphology.

כיפנה, בארעה : Normal E use of final he.

כיפנה : Implies a different pronunciation from that of O, pointed with pathah (the same consonantal form as Ni).

תקף : Ni, O, PJ have תקיף. The E orthography followed here does not necessarily imply Peal instead of Pael as the Pael forms in the CG Mss are usually defectively written.

Genesis 43:2

ויהי כאשר/ והוה כיון די אשלמו למיכל ית עבורה די אייתון מן מצרים ואמר להון אבוהון חזרו זבונו לן קליל מזון.

And when they had finished eating the grain which they had brought from Egypt, their father said to them, "Return, buy us a little food."

והוה : Normal E orthography.

כיון די : Ni כדי. The form used is normal E and Ni M usage corresponding to Hebrew כאשר with the meaning "when."

עבורה : Ni, O, PJ עיבורא .

מן : Ni attached מ; separate מן is the usual E form.

חזרו : Ni חזורו. Here, as usually, the orthography of E has been followed. E and the CG Mss in general are by no means completely consistent in their orthography for verb forms. Ni, however, seems to show influence from Onkelos in addition to normal PT variation.

Since Onkelos here (and regularly) employs a different word for "return" no direct comparison is possible.

זבונו : Ni last letter nun, a scribal error.

לן : The Ni form has been preferred over לנה, the only occurrence of this form in E. לן is the normal PT form.

קליל : E lacks this word; Ni has זעיר. קליל is found in E at verse 4 of this chapter. It fits the context better at 2 and there is no versional evidence for this change, so it has been restored in verse 2. PT uses both קליל and זעיר but seems to prefer קליל for "a small amount."

Note: E and Ni agree in the reading אייתון according to Cowling's concordance; Diez Macho's transcription is אייתיו.[1]

Genesis 43:3

ויאמר אליו/ ואמר ליה יהודה למימר מסהדה אסהד בן גברה למימר לא תחמון סבר אפי ארום אלא הן אתא אחוכון עמכון.

But Judah said to him, "The man solemnly warned us, saying, "You shall not see my countenance unless your brother comes with you."

מסהדה : Ni הא מסהד (the mark above the daleth shows the word was left unfinished). This may be an error, a way of emphasizing the infinitive absolute, or a formation related to the he found in the Hebrew text. This chapter lies within the section showing considerable revision related to the Masoretic text.

בן : Ni; E omits.

תחמון : E; Ni תחמן.

---

1. Cowling has altered a number of Diez Macho's readings on the basis of his own examination of the plates of the text (Thesis, p. 109). His readings are more consistent with E use and are followed here.

אפי: Ni אפוי . Ni very commonly writes וי where י would be expected and presumably was original. E, however, does not use double yodh for this form, and its orthography has been followed.

ארום אלא הן: Ni ארום אלהן; E ארום אלהק . This form is found only here in E. The form restored is more normal for E and Ni M and probably earlier.

אתא: Absent in Ni, agreeing with MT and O. The E reading agrees with LXX.

Genesis 43:4

אם ישך/ אין ברעותך משלחה ית אחונן עמן נחות ונזבון לך (קליל) מזון.

"If it is your pleasure to send our brother with us, we will go down and buy you food;"

אין: Both Ni and E have אן here, and vary between אן and אין . The oldest CG Ms, A, always uses אין, and it is more common in CG as a whole. It has therefore somewhat arbitrarily been adopted as the standard orthography for this critical text.

עמן: Ni; E omits.

לך: Ni; E לן, an error of sight or confusion with verse 2.

(קליל): Found in E; omit with Ni. Cf. verse 2.

Genesis 43:5

ואם אינך/ ואין ליח את משלח לא אנן נחתין ארום גברה אמר לן לא תחזמון סבר אפי אין לא אייתיתון אחוכון עמכון.

"but if you will not send him, we are not going down, for the man said to us, 'You will not see my countenance if you do not bring your brother with you.'"

אנן נחתין : E; Ni נחות. This kind of construction with a participle is characteristic of PT.

אין לא אייתיתון : E; Ni ארום אלהן. Here as in verse 3 E includes a verb construction similar to the Greek, not found in MT.

Genesis 43:6

ויאמר ישראל/ ואמר ישראל למה כען אבאשתון לי למחוויה לגברה הא עד כדון אית לכון אח.

And Israel said, "Why did you treat me so ill as to tell the man whether you had another brother?"

למה כען: E: Ni למה. Normal PT usage includes כען; its omission is probably a sign of revision.

אבאשתון: E; Ni אבישתון. All CG examples of this word use aleph.

למחוויה: E; Ni למתנייה, probably a mistake of sight.

הא עד כדון: E העוד, identical to MT; Ni הא כען. The form restored here is the usual PT reading corresponding to Hebrew העוד.

אח : E; Ni אחוי, dittography with the following Hebrew citation.

Genesis 43:7

ויאמרו שאול/ ואמרין משאול שאל גברה עליין ועל תלדותן למימר הא עד כדון אבוכון בחיין הא אית לכון אח אחרן ותנינן ליה על עסק פתגמייה האליין. הא מדע הוונן ידעין ארום יאמר לן אחיתו ית אחוכון.

And they said, "The man questioned us carefully concerning ourselves and our kindred, saying 'Is your father still alive? Do you have

another brother?' And we told him because of these questions. Could we possibly have known that he would say to us, 'Bring your brother down'?"

ואמרין : E; Ni ואמרן. This use of the participle for "and he (they) said" is normal for PT.

משאול : E; Ni משאל.

גברה : E גוברה, Ni גברא. The more common E spelling has been used.

עליין ועל טלדותן : E; Ni לנא ולטלדותן may be conformed to MT.

בחיין : E; Ni קיים agrees with Onkelos.

הא איתי : E; Ni האיתי. The separate form is more frequent in E, presumably older.

אח אחרן : E; Ni אחוי. אחרן is not found in MT or in LXX. It would, however, be a reasonable amplification and may well be original in PT. Possibly the Ni reading is a remnant of it.

על עסק : E; Ni על פום agrees with MT.

הורנן : E; Ni הוינן.

ידעין : Ni, D. E omits this word, which is needed for the sense of the sentence.

אמר : E; Ni יימר. CG Mss preserve aleph in this verb.

לן : E; absent in Ni; present in LXX.

אחוכון : Ni, D; E אחכון. The form used is more common.

Genesis 43:8

ויאמר יהודה/ ואמר יהודה לישראל אבוי שלח טליה עמי ונקום
ונילך ונחי ולא נמות להוד אנן ולהוד את ולהוד טפלינן.

And Judah said to Israel his father, "Send the lad with me, and we will arise and go, that we may live and not die, both we and you and also our little ones."

טליה : E; Ni, D טליא.

ונילך : E; Ni ונזל.

ונחי : E; Ni ונחיה.

להוד : E להות; Ni לחוד. להוד spelled with he is the most usual CG form.

Genesis 43:9

אנכי אערבנו/ אנה הוא דערביתה מן ידי את תבע יתיה אין לא
אייתיית יתיה לוותך ואקימת יתיה קודמך ואיהוי מרחק מן משאל
בשלמך כל יומייה.

"I will be surety for him; from my hand you shall require him. If I do not bring him to you and set him before you, then let me be alienated from you always."

הוא דערביתה : E; Ni ערביתיה, perhaps conformed to MT.

מן ידי : E, P; Ni מנו, corrupt.

את תבע יתיה : E, Ni; P תדכריניה. Such a form with an attached pronominal suffix cannot be regarded as original.

יתיה : E, Ni here have יתה; both use plene and defectiva orthography alternately. The plene form has been adopted here for convenience in distinguishing it from the feminine object pronoun.

אייתיית : E; Ni אייתי has lost its ending through assimilation.

ואקימת : E; Ni ואקמית.

קודמך : E; the word is missing in Ni. E here reads קדמך but this has been amended to its usual plene form.

ואיהוי : L, P; VBN, E, Ni נהוי. The first person suits the sense of the sentence better. There seems to be a confusion here in the Vatican 440 group and in Paris 110 between this verse and the similar reading at Genesis 44:32.

מן : Ni, PVBNL; E דלא.

משאל : E, VBNL; Ni שאלת; P omits.

בשלמך : E, Ni; PVBNL have the reading belonging at 44:32.

ירומייה : The orthography of E has been followed.

Genesis 43:10

כי לולא/ ארום אילולי דאשתהינן ארום כדון חזרנן ואתינן דנא תריין זמנין.

"For if we had not delayed, we would now have gone and come twice."

אילולי : E; D and Ni have אלולי.

דאשתהינן : D and E; Ni has דאשתהינון. The Ni Ms seems to have a tendency to use waw for a vowels, not only games but pathah as well. This may, however, be influence from the Hebrew in this case.

חזרנן : D and E; Ni חזרנון, another example like the above. The E manuscript ends with this word.

ואתינן : Ni; D omits, following MT. Ni has been taken as original as PT shows some tendency toward use of pairs of words where Hebrew has only one.

דנא : D; Ni דנה. Though PT uses he in many cases it does not normally here. This may be influence from Biblical Aramaic.

תריין : D; Ni תרין. The plene orthography was followed.

Genesis 43:11

ויאמר אלהם/ ואמר להון ישראל אבוהון אין כן גמרתון דא עבדו סבו מן טבה דארעה במניכון ואחיתו לגברה דורון קליל קסף וקליל דבש שעבה ולטום משח דבוסנין ודלוזין.

And Israel their father said to them, "If this is your decision, do this: take some of the choice fruits of the land in your bags, and take down to the man a present--a little balm and a little honey, gum and resin, a measure of pistachios and of almonds."

CG Ms D begins at the middle of this verse; the first six readings listed below are conjectural.

כן : Ni כדן. כן is the normal E and Ni M form.

סבו : Ni סבא, an error.

טבה : Ni טובא, a Hebraism.

ואחיתן : Ni אחתן; cf. verse 7.

לגברה : Ni omits; MT and LXX both have this word.

שעבה : Ni שעוה is closer to the original root form; however, the form employed by both D and E at Genesis 37:25 has been taken here as typical of PT. Onkelos has a different divergence from the root with waw: שעף.

ולטום : D; Ni omits.

דבוסנין : Ni; D דבסמין. These words seem to be interchangeable; the one disagreeing with O has been chosen.

Genesis 43:12

וכסף משנה/ וכסף בדיפלה סבו בידכון וית כספה דאתחזר בפים טעוניכון תחורון בידכון הא דלמה בשלו הווה.

"Take double the money with you; carry back with you the money that was returned in the mouth of your sacks; perhaps it happened by mistake."

בדיפלה : L כדיפליא; Mi, VBN בכיפלה (D lacuna, only beth). The Greek word (διπλᾶ) was used with the orthography found in Ms A at Ex. 22:3, 6. This is an interesting case of two genuinely Palestinian variants. O and PJ have על חד תרין here.

הא דלמה : Ni דילמא; D מא דלמא. מה דלמה is the usual Mi text form. הא דלמה is found in Ni M frequently in opposition to the text reading. None of the witnesses that would be expected to agree with Mi M are extant here. Here again both variants are Palestinian, although Ni in this verse (only) conforms to O.

בשלו הוה: D has beth, then a lacuna. Mi has שלו הות (the reading of O). PJ has בשלו הוה which, since it differs from O and seems to agree with D, has been taken as the probable PT reading.

Genesis 43:13-14

ואת אחיכם/ ויח אחוכון סבו ואזלו חזרו לוות גברה. ואל שדי/
ואלה שמיה ישוי לכון רחמין קדם שליטה דארעה וישלח לכון
ית אחוכון אחרנה ויח בנימן ואנה היך מה די אתכליח על יוסף
ברי לא ארסף למתכלה על בנימן.

"And take your brother and go, return to the man, and may the God of heaven grant you mercy before the ruler of the land, that he may send back your other brother and Benjamin. Since I am bereaved of my son Joseph, let me not also be bereaved of Benjamin."

ישוי : Ni ושוי, scribal error; D יתן, agreeing with Onkelos.

שליטה דארעה : Mi שליטיא; D דארעא ( ) גוברא ; perhaps גוברא is a revision to Onkelos.

The final, expanded clause of verse 14 appears in varying forms in the different witnesses. The reconstruction made here follows D in the first half of the clause and Ni in the second. The versions are as follows:

Ni: And I, since I am not bereaved of my son Joseph, will not also be bereaved of Benjamin.

D: And I, since I am bereaved of my son Joseph, will not also be bereaved either of Simeon or of Benjamin.

PVBNL: And I, since I am not bereaved of my son Joseph, thus I also will not be bereaved either of Simeon or of Benjamin.

PJ: And I, behold, I am now certified by the Holy Spirit that if I am bereaved of Joseph, I shall also be bereaved of Simeon and of Benjamin.

It seems possible that the reading in the first phrase was originally that of D, די אתכלית, and was misunderstood as the reading found in the other versions, דלא תכלת. An oversized yodh could conceivably be mistaken for a lamedh and the aleph then wrongly attached.

In the second phrase the shorter reading of Ni has been followed. It seems possible that the further mention of Simeon was added secondarily to bring this part of the verse into parallelism with the first part, which mentions both brothers. However, since it is obvious throughout the narrative that Israel's concern for Simeon is entirely secondary to that for Benjamin, the shorter reading is most probably original.

Genesis 43:15-16

ויקחו האנשים/ ונסבו גבריה דורון הדה וכסף בדיפלה נסבו
בידיהון ויח בנימן וקמו ונחתו למצרים וקמו קודם יוסף.
וירא יוסף/ רחמה יוסף עמהון ית בנימן ואמר למן דהוה ממני על
בייתיה אעיל ית גבריה לגו בייתה ונכוס נכיסה ואתקין ארום
גבי יאכלון גבריה בשעת טהרה.

And the men took this gift, and double the money they took with them, and Benjamin, and they arose and they went down to Egypt and stood before Joseph. And when Joseph saw Benjamin with them, he said to the man who had charge of his house, "Bring the men into the house, and slaughter an animal and make ready, for the men are to eat with me at noontime."

בדיפלה: Ni מכופלה; cf. verse 12.

רחמה יוסף: Restored. Ni lacks these words because of haplography with the Hebrew verse-opening. D has a lacuna at this point.

על בייתיה: D על פלטין דידיה; Ni אפיטרופוס על בייתיה agrees with PJ. At 43:24 Ms E has the reading restored here. This conservative reading agreeing with MT also seems to agree with LXX, which has simply "house." There is no evidence of LXX or the versions of the Hexapla using the Hellenized forms of "palatium" and "praetorium," and "epitropos" is not used in the Pentateuch. This does not, of course, rule out their possible originality in PT. These words are not found in CG Ms E and "palation" has been found in Ni M thus far only at Genesis 44:14, where neither MT nor LXX supplies any word, both reading simply "to Joseph." The variant readings are, in any case, very interesting.

לגו בייתה : D לגו פלטין; Ni לפלטורין . See the discussion above.

ונכוס נכיסה: D; Ni ינכוס נכסון , probably a corruption of ונכוס נכסין.

ואתקין: D; Ni ואתקן . Plene orthography for Aphel used.

גבי : D; Ni has עמדי , a Hebraism.

בשעת טהרה: This is the E reading in the parallel expression at Genesis 43:25, and has been adopted here in keeping with the general policy of adhering to a text of the E type. The reading of Ni and D is closer to that of Onkelos.

Genesis 43:17-18

ויעש האיש/ ועבד גברה הין מה דאמר יוסף ואעל גברה ית גבריה לבייתה דיוסף. ויירא האנשים/ ודחלו גבריה ארום אתעלו לבייתה דיוסף ואמרין על עסיק כספה דאתחזר בטעונינן בקדמייתה אנן מתעלין למתרברבה עלינן ולמתנטלה עלינן ולמסב יתן לעבדין וית חמרינן.

And the man did as Joseph said and brought the men to Joseph's house. And the men were afraid because they were brought to Joseph's house, and they said, "It is on account of the money which was returned in our sacks the first time that we are brought in, that he may contend against us and fall upon us and make us slaves and seize our asses."

לבייתה: Ni לפלטורין.

עסיק : D; Ni עיסק .

בטעונינן : Ni; D "בפים ט could be an expansion made by recalling this reading in other sections of the Joseph story.

עלינן : D; Ni עלינא.

ולמתנטלה : D; Ni ולמתעקפא , agreeing with PJ.

Genesis 43:19-21

ויגשו אל האיש/ וקרבו לוות גברה דהורה ממני על בייתה דיוסף
ומללו עמיה בתרעה דבייתה. ויאמרו בי אדני/ ואמרין בבעו
רבוני מחת נחתין בקדמייתה למזבן מזון. ויהי כי באנו/ והורה
כיוון דמטינן לבית אבתותה ופתחנן ית טעונינן והא כספה דגבר
בפם טעוניה כספינן במתקליה וחזרנן יתיה בידנן.

So they approached the man who had charge of Joseph's house and spoke with him at the door of the house. And they said, "If you please, my lord, we came down the first time to buy food. And when we arrived at the lodging place we opened our sacks, and there was every man's money in the mouth of his sack, our money in full weight; so we have brought it again with us."

על בייתה : Ni על פלטורין ; P (agreeing with PJ) אפיטרופוס על ביתיה.

ומללו : Ni ומללון ; strong verbs are not usually munated in PT.

דבייתה : Ni פלטורין.

כיוון דמטינן : D כד מטינן ; Ni ארום עלינן agreeing with MT. The reading chosen is in accordance with E and Ni H usage.

אבתותה : D אבתותא ; Ni אבותה here, agreeing with D elsewhere.

בידנן : Ni בידנא.

Genesis 43:22

וכסף אחר/ וכספה אחרנה אחתנן בידינן למזבן מזון לא ידעינן
מן שוי כספה בטעונן.

"And we have brought down other money with us to buy food. We do not know who put the money in our sacks."

לבייתה: E; Ni לפלטורין.

ושוי: E; Ni ויהב with O and PJ. The verse in its restored form shows the distinction made in the Aramaic of PT between "set" and "give."

וראתקנו: Ni and E; D וראע(לו . The reading of D is the one disagreeing with O and PJ but the meaning does not seem appropriate.

עד מעליה : D and E; Ni with עד זמן דאתא uses a common PT expression so this is a quite valid variant.

בשעת טהרה: E; Ni and D read באטון שירותא ; cf. verse 16.

ארום תמן: Ni, E; D has דתמן which would be normal usage for the Palestinian Talmud but not for the Targum, which consistently uses ארום.

יכלון: E; Ni ייכלון ; D אכלין.

מזון : This reading is a correction in E, written above the original לחם which is found also in Ni and D. The correction preserves the PT distinction between "food" and "bread."

Genesis 43:26

ויבא יוסף הבייתה/ ועל יוסף לגו בייתה ואייתון ליה ית דורון דאית בידיהון בבייתה ושאלו בשלמיה כנימוס ארעה.

When Joseph entered his house, they brought him the gift which they had with them in the house, and they inquired about his welfare, according to the custom of the land.

With this verse the Neofiti marginalia begin. There may be some question, however, whether they start at the beginning of the verse or only at the middle. The absence of a marginal variant for the first two readings may indicate marginal agreement with the text; the third,

however, is a very common and constant variant and would be expected. It represents the normal PT use before a preposition, a usage almost entirely eliminated in the Neofiti 1 text.

לגו בייתה : Ni; E לבייתה. לגו is used commonly but by no means invariably in PT. The writer has not yet discovered whether it has a clear meaning differentiating it from simple lamedh.

ואייתון : Ni; E ואעלו agrees with O and PJ.

דאית : E; Ni די .

בבייתה : Ni M; E לבייתה; Ni לפלטורין.

ושאלו : Ni M, E; Ni ושאלון.

Genesis 43:27

וישאל להם/ ושאל להון מלין דשלום ואמר הא שלם הוא אבוכון סבה די אמרתון הא עד כדון הוא בחיין.

And he inquired about their welfare, and he said, "Is your father well, the old man about whom you spoke? Is he still alive?"

מלין דשלם : E, Ni M; Ni בשלם.

די : E, Ni M; Ni ד ; די is the standard PT form for אשר.

אמרתון : E; Ni אמריתון, a scribal error.

כדון : E, Ni M; Ni כען with Onkelos.

Genesis 43:28

ויאמרו שלום/ ואמרין הא שלם הוא עבדך אבונן הא עד כדון הוא בחיין ועקדו ואודון ושבחו.

And they said, "Indeed, your servant our father is well, he is still alive." And they bowed, and praised and complimented (him).

הא שלם הוא עבדך: Ni M; E is missing here (lacuna); Ni and D have שלם לעבדך in agreement with O and PJ.

הא עד כדון: Ni M; E missing; D עד כען ; Ni הא.

ואודון ושבחו: Ni, D (Ni ואודו); E with ושאלו בשלמיה seems out of place here; cf. verse 26.

Genesis 43:29

וישא עיניו/ ונטל עיינוי וחמה ית בנימן אחוי ברה דאמה ואמר הדין הוא אחוכון זעירה די אמרתון לי ואמר מימריה דיי יחוס עליך ברי.

And he lifted up his eyes and saw Benjamin his brother, the son of his mother, and he said, "Is this your youngest brother, of whom you spoke to me?" And he said, "May the Word of the Lord be gracious to you, my son!"

מן קדם יי יהוי מימריה דיי יחוס עליך : Ni M, E; Ni with is closer to O and PJ.

Genesis 43:30

וימהר יוסף/ וזרז יוסף ארום גלו מעוי על אחוי רבעה למבכי ועל לקיטונה ובכה תמן.

Then Joseph made haste, for his heart was moved on account of his brother, and he sought (a place) to weep; and he went to his chamber and wept there.

וזרז E; Ni ואוחי . Ni M is not present here but זרז is a regular M reading against Ni text אוחי in all other instances (13 out of 14). D agrees with Ni.

גלו מעוי: Ni; E, Ni M אתגוללו רחמוי . The Neofiti text here seems to preserve a reading closer to that of the Greek texts,

which have various versions of "entrails" or "intestines." Here Ni M and E agree with Onkelos, although it is more usual for Ni text to do so. Since the words involved are used in both O and PT elsewhere, this is not necessarily a direct revision to Onkelos; it may be a replacement of a literal rendition of the Greek with the traditional targumic interpretation.

ובעה : E, Ni; D וחבע.

Genesis 43:31-32

וירחץ פניו/ ושזג אפוי ונפק ואזדרז ואמר שוון מזון. וישימו לולבדו/ ושוון ליה לבלחודוי ולהון לבלחודיהון ולמצראי דהוון אכלין עמיה לבלחודיהון ארום לא הוון יכלין מצראי למיכל עם עבראי מזון ארום מרחק היא למצראי.

And they served him alone, and them by themselves, and the Egyptians who were eating with him by themselves, for the Egyptians cannot eat food with Hebrews, for it is improper for the Egyptians.

ושזג : E, D ושזיג , VBNL ושזגי ; Ni ושגג, scribal error.

ואזדרז : E, Ni; D, Ni M ואשתהי , "and he was delayed." Ni M usually agrees with E rather than D; perhaps this is a secondary marginale. PJ agrees with E and Ni here and Onkelos has still another word. The meaning of the marginal and D reading does not seem as appropriate as that of E and Ni.

מזון : E, Ni M; D, Ni לחם.

ולהון : E; Ni ולהו, error.

ולמצראי , עבראי: In the first instance E gives the gentilic ending as יאי; in the second, Ni has יי. The ending used is the normal one. Ni often has יי in the margin against אי in the text.

דהוון אכלין : E; Ni דאכלין . The reading of E is the characteristic PT rendition corresponding to Hebrew participle with the article.

Genesis 43:33-34

וישבו לפניו/ ויתבו קודמוי רבה כרבותיה וזעירה כזעירותיה
ותמהו גבריה גבר לחבריה. וישא משאת/ ונסב חולקין מן קדמוי
ופלג להון ורבי חולקה דבנימן מן חולקיהון דכולהון חמשה
חולקין ושתון ורבון עמיה.

And they sat before him, the oldest according to his age and the youngest according to his youth; and the men looked at one another in amazement. And portions were taken from before him and apportioned to them, but Benjamin's portion was five times as much as any of theirs. So they drank and were merry with him.

ויתבו קודמוי : E, D, Ni M; Ni וארבע יתהון קדמוי.

כרבותיה : E, Ni M; Ni כרביותה seems to be an error.

ונסב : Ni; E has only the first two letters followed by a lacuna, restored in Kahle's text as ונסל . The reading different from that of Onkelos has been preferred.

ורבי חולקה : Ni, E; Ni M ואסגי חולקוי is closer to O. It is not certain whether this phrase is intended to replace the one in the text or perhaps supplement it, in view of the possessive ending on "portion." It is difficult to know whether to regard these occasional readings disagreeing with E as secondary marginalia or as genuine variations in the primary marginalia. In some cases readings are clearly secondary because they do not agree with normal usage for E; this is not true of the reading in question.

דכולהון : E, Ni M; Ni דכולן.

ורבון : E, Ni M; Ni ורוון.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Although an oral tradition of translation and interpretation of the Scriptures may have existed in the synagogues before the beginning of the Christian era, the language of the Palestinian Targum which is found in various recensions in the Cairo Geniza manuscripts, the Vatican 440 and Paris 110 (Fragment Targum) groups, and Codex Neofiti 1, cannot be identified with that of this early tradition. Although it may contain passages earlier than the translation in language, particularly where poetic paraphrase is found, its basic translation language is very closely related to that of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim and should not be regarded as earlier than the third century A. D.

Because of certain peculiarities of language which cannot be attributed either to a Hebrew Vorlage or to normal Aramaic usage, the Palestinian Targum should be understood as a translation from a Greek version.

Codex Neofiti 1 has been more heavily revised than any of the members of the Cairo Geniza group. A tendency to correct the text to conform more closely to the Masoretic text is especially noticeable. The Cairo Geniza texts themselves, however, show considerable variation between the earliest and latest witnesses. The language variations within the Palestinian Targum family have usually been taken as evidence for the free, unfixed, and colloquial nature of the language

employed, and it has been assumed that the various recensions had arisen independently out of the oral tradition. The writer agrees with Geoffrey Cowling that the degree of variation has been exaggerated and that these texts can be understood as stemming from a single translation. This conclusion is necessary if the Greek hypothesis is to be accepted; it is also supported independently from this hypothesis by the occurrence of a number of distinctive translation forms peculiar to the Palestinian Targum (differing, for example, from Palestinian Talmudic usage, which is in general very close to that of this Targum), discovered by the writer and discussed in Chapter III.

The writer has further noted that the versions of the Palestinian Targum, particularly the early texts found in the Cairo Geniza, do not show a gradual change and mixing of forms, as would be expected if the variations of the later versions came about under the influence of Targum Onkelos, or of scribal familiarity with Eastern forms in general. Rather, a word used consistently in an early version will disappear completely, replaced by another word of identical meaning. The writer is of the opinion that the variations between the earliest texts, manuscripts A and E of the Cairo Geniza, and later versions, can be understood as perfectly conscious and deliberate revisions which maintained the language in conformity with a still living and changing Palestinian Aramaic. This conclusion was reached because of the correlation between regular language changes within the Palestinian Targum tradition and the existence of two or more forms within the language of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim, as set forth by Dalman. If this theory, here proposed for

the first time, is supported by further study, the language of the Palestinian Targum can be utilized in an entirely new way: to establish linguistic criteria for dating within the Talmudic-Midrashic period.

Although Codex Neofiti 1 is a later version of the Palestinian Targum, belonging to the latest period in the revision process described above and showing other revisions and lateral influences from Targums Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, and possibly the Paris 110 version (which is basically a quite different recension from Ni), it nevertheless is valuable for the recovery of the language of the Palestinian Targum. Many relatively infrequent forms, known previously in one instance or not at all, can be established as regular Palestinian Targum usage with the aid of this complete text. The principal set of marginalia of Neofiti, furthermore, have been identified as representatives of a text very close to Cairo Geniza manuscript E, one of the best witnesses to an early form of the Palestinian Targum. The identity found in specific readings is also apparent in the agreement of E and Ni M in morphology and lexicography. The marginalia occur sufficiently consistently that the absence of a marginal alternate for any word occurring more than a very few times, and in more than one section of the text, in Neofiti 1, is excellent evidence that the reading of the text is the Palestinian Targum reading--even if all other evidence is lacking. This judgment can be made because of the fortunate extreme contrast between the language of the late Neofiti text version and the early version of the margin.

With the aid of the marginalia, Cairo Geniza manuscript E where available, and the Vatican 440 and (sometimes) the Paris 110 groups

(secondary witnesses to the same text), some progress can be made toward reconstructing the original readings of the Palestinian Targum.

Codex Neofiti 1 for most of its length seems to represent a single recension, despite some inconsistently made revisions and a considerable number of scribal errors. However, the manuscript shows definite signs of the use of other recensions to complete a defective text at the beginning and the end. This process of replacement of the readings of worn or missing pages from other recensions must have occurred several times in the history of the transmission of the text, for short sections from five separate recensions--each identifiable by characteristic orthography, morphology or vocabulary--can be found in the first four chapters of Genesis, and at least two between Deuteronomy 29:18 and 34:12. Genesis 1 is very nearly identical to the Paris 110 recension, and Deuteronomy 34 to Vatican 440. Although some note had been taken of the existence of these variations by previous writers (Shirley Lund discovered the break in the text and marginalia in Deuteronomy, and Geoffrey Cowling suggested the existence of a similar situation at the beginning of Genesis), they are here explicitly identified and described for the first time. The isolation of the multiple texts of Genesis 1-4 has simultaneously solved the problem of the alternation of two forms of marginal abbreviations in the first few chapters of Genesis and their disappearance thereafter.

The presence of this variety of material suggests an active history of transmission for the Palestinian Targum. Perhaps further witnesses to this interesting text family will yet be discovered.

At present, the recovery of the complete Neofiti 1 manuscript has made possible a considerable advance in our understanding of the text and language of the Palestinian Targum.

The language of Targum Onkelos shows relationship to the language of the Genesis Apocryphon and particularly to that of the Bar Kochba letters, on the one hand, and to the language of the Palestinian Targum, on the other, supporting a judgment that its origin is probably second century A. D. Whether it was composed in Judea or composed by a Judean in Babylonia, its language can be linked with dialects found in Palestine. In its present form, it shows a scrupulous correspondence to the Masoretic text and to Mishnaic regulations. Whether the literal Targum to Leviticus found at Qumran is directly related to Onkelos cannot be determined until this fragmentary text is published. Even then, the fragment may not be extensive enough for a judgment to be made.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, in spite of considerable employment of Palestinian vocabulary and inclusion of Palestinian expansions, seems to be dependent upon Targum Onkelos for basic language patterns. Its combination of disparate language elements from Onkelos, the Palestinian Targum, the Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim (usages differing from those of the Targum), and the Babylonian Talmud suggests that it was composed when these languages were no longer in active use. Cowling's suggestion that it dates from the eighth or ninth century A. D., when early material of the type it includes became available, may be accepted. This early material is peculiar to Pseudo-Jonathan; if the view of the origins of the Palestinian Targum

and Pseudo-Jonathan given here is accepted, there is no reason to suppose it was ever a part of the Palestinian Targum version attested by the Cairo Geniza texts, the Vatican 440 and Paris 110 groups, and Neofiti 1.

It is true that all three Targum groups sometimes preserve in common traditions not found elsewhere. In spite of this evidence for their dependence on some common source, there is no necessity to assume any direct relation in the creation of the basic translations. Thus the same Palestinian tradition could be appropriated independently by Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum from oral haggadic sources, and Pseudo-Jonathan (in spite of its dependence on the translation language of Onkelos) might preserve yet another (and often fuller) version of this tradition. As far as <u>language</u> is concerned, Onkelos and the Palestinian Targum must be regarded as independent witnesses to distinct dialects--the first as a second century A. D. Judean Aramaic translation from Hebrew, the second as a third-century A. D. Galilean Aramaic translation from Greek. Pseudo-Jonathan taken as a whole involves language elements from diverse times and places. With further study it might be possible to isolate the probable native dialect of its writer (<u>not</u> Palestinian Aramaic, in this writer's opinion) and other elements used in its composition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baars, W. "A Targum on Exodus XV 7-21 from the Cairo Geniza." Vetus Testamentum, XI (1961), 340-42.

_____. Review in Vetus Testamentum, XVII (1967), 127-28.

Bacher, W. "Targum." Jewish Encyclopedia. 1906. Vol. XII.

Bassfreund, Jacob. Das Fragmenten-Targum zum Pentateuch: sein Ursprung und Charakter und sein Verhältniss zu den anderen pentateuchischen Targumim. Breslau: Schottlaender, 1896.

Bauer, Hans, and Leander, Pontus. Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927

Bernheimer, Carlo. Paleografia Ebraica. Florence: Olschki, 1924.

Biblia Polyglotta Matritensa. Series IV. Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. L. 5: Deuteronomium, caput 1. Editio critica curante A. Diez Macho. Madrid, 1965.

Biblia Rabbinica. Edited by Felix Pratensis. 1st ed. Venice: Bomberg, 1517-18.

Birkeland, Harris. The Language of Jesus. Avhandlinger Utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. II. Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1954. No. 1. Oslo: I Kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad, 1954.

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 3rd ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1967.

_____. "Die Erforschung der Muttersprache Jesu." Theologische Literaturzeitung, IX (1957), 654-68.

_____. "The Recovery of the Language of Jesus." New Testament Studies, III (1957), 305-13.

Black, Matthew, and Fohrer, Georg, eds. In Memorian Paul Kahle. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1968.

Black, Matthew. "Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus." Pp. 17-28.

Doubles, Malcolm C. "Indications of Antiquity in the Orthography and Morphology of the Fragment Targum." Pp. 79-89.

Kuiper, G. J. "A Study of the Relationship between A Genesis Apocryphon and the Pentateuchal Targumim in Genesis 14:1-12." Pp. 149-61.

Lund, Shirley. "The Sources of the Variant Readings to Deuteronomy 1:1 to 29:17 of Codex Neofiti 1." Pp. 167-73.

Bloch, Renée. "Note Methodologique pour l'Étude de la Littérature Rabbinique." Recherches de Science Religieuse, XLIII (1955), 194-227.

_____. "Note sur l'utilisation des fragments de la Geniza du Caire pour l'étude du Targum Palestinien." Revue des Études Juives, XIV (1955), 5-35.

Boccaccio, Father. "Integer Textus Targum Hierosolymitana primum inventus in codice Vaticana." Biblica, XXXVIII (1957), 237-39.

Brederek, Emil, ed. Konkordanz zum Targum Onkelos. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft IX. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1906.

Cowling, Geoffrey J. "New Light on the New Testament? The Significance of the Palestinian Targum." The Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin, University of Aberdeen, Spring, 1968.

_____. "The Palestinian Targum: Textual and Linguistic Investigations in Codex Neofiti I and Allied Manuscripts." Thesis presented to the University of Aberdeen in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, April, 1968.

_____. "Cairo Geniza Concordance." Appendix to Ph. D. Thesis, 1968.

Dalman, Gustaf. Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch. 2nd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960. Photographic reproduction. First published 1905.

_____. Die Worte Jesu. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898. 2nd ed., Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930. English translation, The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.

de Vaux, Ronald. L'Archéologie et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1959. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Diez Macho, Alejandro. "En torno a la datación del Targum 'Palestinien.'" Sefarad, XX (1960), 3-16.

_____. "La Lengua hablada por Jesucristo." Oriens Antiquus, II (1963), 95-132.

_____. "Nuevos fragmentos del Targum Palestinense." Sefarad, XV (1955), 31-39.

_____. "The Palestinian Targum." Christian News from Israel, XIII (1962), 19-25.

_____. "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the other Targums." Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, VII, Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960. Pp. 222-45.

_____. "Targum y Nuevo Testamento." Mélanges Eugene Tisserant. Vol. I. Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1964. Pp. 153-85.

_____. "Una Copia Completa del Targum Palestinense al Pentateuco en la Biblioteca Vaticana." Sefarad, XVII (1957), 119-21.

_____. "Una Copia de todo el Targum jerosolymitano en la Vatican." Estudios Biblicos, XVI (1956), 446-47.

Doubles, Malcolm C. "A Critical Re-examination of the Editio Princeps, Das Fragmententhargum by Moses Ginsburger, in the Light of Recent Discoveries." Thesis presented to the University of St. Andrews in application for the degree of Ph.D., June, 1962.

_____. "Toward the Publication of the Extant Texts of the Palestinian Targum(s)." Vetus Testamentum, XV (1965), 16-26.

Etheridge, J. W. The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum. New York: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1968. First published 1862.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary. Biblica et Orientalia N. 18. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.

Frankel, Z. Vorstudien zur Septuaginta. Leipzig: Vogel, 1841.

_____. Über den Einfluss der palästinische Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik (Pentateuchus). Leipzig: Barth, 1851.

Geiger, Abraham. Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von den innern Entwicklung des Judenthums. Breslau: Verlag von Julius Hainauer, 1857.

Ginsburger, Moses. Das Fragmententhargum (Thargum jeruschalmi zum Pentateuch). Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1899.

_____. Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Usiël zum Pentateuch). Berlin: S. Calvary & Co., 1903.

Grelot, P. "Les Targums du Pentateuque: Étude comparative d'après Genèse, IV, 3-16." Semitica, IX (1959), 59-88.

Jastrow, Marcus, ed. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. 2 vols. New York: Pardes Publishing House, Inc., 1950. First published 1903.

Kahle, Paul. The Cairo Geniza. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.

_____. Masoreten des Westens, II. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1930.

_____. "Das palästinische Pentateuchtargum und das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramäisch." Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIX (1959), 100-116.

_____. "Das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramäisch: Erwiderung." Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LI (1960), 55.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Baumgartner, Walter, eds. Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. 3rd ed. Vol. I. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

_____. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. 2nd ed. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

_____. Supplementum ad Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

Komlos, Y. "Nosah ha-Targum ʿal qᵉriʾat Yam-Suf." Sinai, XXII (1959), 223-28.

Kuiper, Gerard Johannes. "The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and Its Relationship to Targum Onkelos." Thesis presented to the University of St. Andrews in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 1962.

Kutscher, E. Y. "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study." Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Scripta Hierosolymitana, Vol. IV. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1957. Pp. 1-35.

_____. "Leshonan shel ha-iggarot ha-ibriyyot wa-arammiyyot shel Bar Kosebah u-bene doro." Leshonenu, XXV (1960-61), 117-33.

_____. "Mittelhebräisch und Jüdisch-Aramäisch im Neuen Köhler-Baumgartner." Hebräische Wortforschung. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, XVI. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967. Pp. 158-75.

_____. "Studies in Galilean Aramaic." In Hebrew. Tarbiz, XXI-XXIII (1949-52). Offprint, pp. 1-58.

_____. "Das zur Zeit Jesu gesprochene Aramäisch." Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LI (1960), 46-54.

Le Deaut, Roger. "A Propos d'une Leçon du Codex Neofiti 1 (Lev. V 21)." Vetus Testamentum, XVII (1967), 362-63.

_____. "Jalons pour une histoire d'un manuscrit du Targum palestinien (Neofiti 1)." Biblica, XLVIII (1967), 509-33.

_____. La Nuit Pascale: Essai sur la significacion de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42. Analecta Biblica 22. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963.

Lund, Shirley. "An Introductory Study of the Codex Neofiti 1 with Special Reference to the Marginal Readings to the Book of Deuteronomy." Thesis presented to the University of St. Andrews in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, August, 1966.

Luzzatto, S. D. Elementi grammaticale del Caldeo Biblico e del Dialetto Talmudico Babilonese. Padua: A. Bianchi, 1865.

Mandelkern, Solomon, ed. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. 6th ed. Tel-Aviv: Schocken Publishing House Lts., 1964.

Martin, M. Fitzmaurice. "The Palaeographical Character of Codex Neofiti 1." Textus. Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project, III. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1963. Pp. 1-35.

McNamara, Martin. The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. Analecta Biblica 27. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.

_____. "Targumic Studies." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVIII (1966), 1-19.

Milik, J. T. "'Saint-Thomas de Phordesa' et Gen. 14,17." Biblica, XLII (1961), 77-84.

Nöldeke, Theodor. Die alttestamentliche Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsatzen dargestellt von Theodor Nöldeke. Leipzig: Quandt & Händel, 1868.

Odeberg, Hugo. The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba, with Grammar of Galilean Aramaic. 2 vols. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1939.

Orlinsky, Harry Meyer, and Stenning, John Frederick. "Targum." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1965. Vol. XXI.

Purvis, James D. Review in Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XXVI (1967), 229-30.

Roberts, Bleddyn J. The Old Testament Text and Versions. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951.

Rosenthal, Franz. Die Aramäistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964. Photographic reproduction. First published 1939.

Rossell, William H. A Handbook of Aramaic Magical Texts. Shelton Semitic Series, Number II. Ringwood Borough, N. J.: Shelton College, 1953.

Roth, Cecil, et al. "Jews." Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1965. Vol. XII.

Schelbert, George. "Exodus xxii 4 im Palästinischen Targum." Vetus Testamentum, VIII (1958), 253-63.

Seligsohn, Hermann. De Duabus Hierosolymitanis Pentateuchi Paraphrasibus. Breslau: Typis Sulzbach, 1858.

Sperber, Alexander, ed. The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. I. The Pentateuch According to Targum Onkelos. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Stevenson, William B. Grammar of Palestinian-Jewish Aramaic. 2nd ed. with an Appendix on the Numerals by J. A. Emerton. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1962.

Strack, H. L. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. English translation of German 5th ed. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1965. First published 1931.

van der Woude, A. S. "Das Hiobtargum aus Qumran Höhle XI." Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, IX, Congress Volume, Bonn, 1962. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963. Pp. 322-31.

Vermes, Geza. "Baptism and Jewish Exegesis: New Light from Ancient Sources." New Testament Studies, IV (1958), 308-19.

_____. Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies. Studia Post-Biblica, IV. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

_____. "The Targumic Versions of Genesis IV 3-16." The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society, Vol. III, 1961-62. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963. Pp. 81-114.

Weil, G. E. "Le Codex Neophiti I--a propos de l'article de M. F. Martin." Textus, Annual of the Hebrew University Bible Project, IV. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1964. Pp. 225-29.

Wernberg-Møller, P. "An Inquiry into the Validity of the text-critical argument for an early dating of the recently discovered Palestinian Targum." Vetus Testamentum, XII (1962), 312-30.

Yadin, Y. "Expedition D." Israel Exploration Journal, XI (1961), 36-52.

Zunz, Leopold. Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden. Berlin: A. Asher, 1832. 2nd ed., Frankfurt on Main: J. Kaufman, 1892.

VITA

Julia Adair Foster was born May 21, 1937 in Jacksonville, Florida. The daughter of a Methodist minister, she lived in five different Florida communities before graduating from Fort Lauderdale High School, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in 1954.

She matriculated at Duke University in 1954, receiving her A. B. in 1958, with a major in religion.

She matriculated at Boston University School of Theology in 1958 in the M. R. E. program. The following year she changed her degree objective to S. T. B. with Ph. D. Objective, with an emphasis in Biblical Studies. At the completion of S. T. B. courses in February, 1963, she was admitted to Boston University Graduate School as a Ph. D. candidate in Old Testament. She received the Roswell R. Robinson Fellowship award for 1964-65.

During 1968-69 she was a Lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament at Boston University.

In May, 1969 she received the Ph. D. in Theological Studies from Boston University Graduate School.